Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and ecclesiastical contemporary history

Monthly Bulletin.

Published

by the

German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other states.

Edited by

Teachers' College of St. Louis Seminary.

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he loveth them the better that they find feist; but this he cannot suffer, that the dogs bark in hostility."

Fifteenth Year. 1869.

St. Louis, Mo.
Printing office of the "Synod" of Missouri, Ohio, and other states.

1869.

Table of Contents.

January.

Preface 1
Materials on Pastoral Theology 9
The fertility of error 14
The decisions of the General Assembly of the Church on the four points 19
Litterary Intelligences 24
Ecclesiastical-temporal- 25

February.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 33
Is the Antichrist to be found in the atheism of our time? 39
Protest of the English District of the Synod of Ohio against a resolution of the same concerning the former 45
Minority report on the four points known to you 48
Dance and church discipline 50
Mineral Intelligences 53
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 58

March.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 65
Letter to the author of the paper: "Lending Money to Interests in Respect of the Commandment of Charity" 70
Litterary Intelligences 83
Miscellanies 83
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 87

April.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 97
On the resurrection before the millennial kingdom 103
About funeral orations 112
Miscellanies 115
Litterary Intelligences 119
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 119

May.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 129
What is the fundamental in Christianity? 132
Poem by H. M. Johanni Huttenlocher 146
Miscellanies 153
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 158

June.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 161
Antithesis to the Thesis: What is Theology? 164
An Illumination of the Doctrine of Money Interest according to Protestant Principles together with an Appendix: Summarical Excerpt of I. Gerhard's Doctrine of Usury 181
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 182

July.

Page
Materials on Pastoral Theology 193
Pastor Diedrich and the Antichrist 198
Lic. Dr. E. Preuß. 203
Free state and bound church 210
Litterary Intelligences 215
Miscellanies 216
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary 218

August.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 225
On the Infallibility of the Pope 231
The fifth point 243
Miscellanies 247
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 251

September.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 257
The four kingdoms of Daniel 260
How a faithful pastor who is distressed about the spiritual condition of his congregation can take hold of his mind 267
Some remarks on the doctrine of reincarnation 273
A document from the Middle Ages279
Litterary intelligences 280
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 281

October.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 291
The four kingdoms of Daniel 295
The Papacy 304
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 315

November.

Materials on Pastoral Theology 321
The four kingdoms of Daniel 325
In defense of Christianity 330
A litterary curiosity 336
Litterary Intelligences 341
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 342

December.

The Status Controversiae 353
The four kingdoms of Daniel 360
In defense of Christianity 368
Materialism 376
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 379

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume XV January 1869. No. 1.

Preface.

This is the twofold task that the present journal has set itself from the beginning; God willing, it will also be its sincere endeavor to solve this twofold task in the fifteenth year that begins with this issue. Most of our honored readers will not need any justifying reasons for their intention to continue to contribute to the construction of doctrine as a pastoral-theological journal; our journal, on the other hand, will probably encounter all the more serious reservations with the declaration that in the future, too, doctrine should go hand in hand with defense. Even a reader who was not unfriendly to it recently questioned its "legitimacy. We are therefore permitted to express ourselves in a few words about this point in this "preface".

Those of our readers who think that we are fighting for the special pleasure of disputing in addition to teaching, we can assure on our conscience that they are thoroughly mistaken in this. It is reported of the disputatious opponent of Spener, Johannes Deutschmann, Calov's son-in-law, that he confessed: "He is never more amused and healthy than when he disputes; indeed, disputing is his best medicine against the stone," by which he was violently afflicted. But as we have never been friends of the theological direction of Deutschmann, nor have we been to this hour, so we are still less dominated by the pleasure which this theologian, who, however, was more experienced in the dialectical arts than others, felt in continual disputing. Rather, by God's grace, it gives us incomparably greater joy as often as a truth is revealed to us in our search in Scripture than when we are compelled to refute an error, even if we succeed in confronting it victoriously with God's help; and we consider it an abomination to begin a doctrinal dispute merely for the sake of argument, not for God's glory and the salvation of souls.

But that we not only teach, but also defend, has simply its reason in this: That "all Scripture, inspired of God," is useful and given not only "for doctrine," but also "for punishment," for elenchus, for the refutation of false doctrine; that a servant of Christ, according to God's express words, should not only be "able to teach," but also be able "to punish the gainsayers." that all the faithful servants of the Lord, even the prophets and apostles, nay, Christ the Lord Himself, have in this respect preceded all those who desire to be faithful stewards of God's mysteries; and finally, that the experience of all ages shows how necessary it is to resist, if the faith is to be preserved intact, "which was once given to the saints." It is true that if every falsification of doctrine is met with earnestness, it very commonly gains the appearance of only causing confusion, and of quite irresponsibly placing the greatest obstacle in the way of the spread of the kingdom of God. The unyielding fighters of every emerging error have therefore in their time been regarded by the great multitude not as a blessing, but as a curse of the world and Christianity, confusing Israel, as obstinate, proud, peace-loving enemies of the church, whose death was longed for and welcomed as a deliverance of the church from a plague, especially when the error fought by them appeared not gross, but subtle, and as such a departure from the truth that was not worth speaking of. Consider the Arian, Nestorian, and Eutychian disputes concerning the doctrine of the person of Christ, which lasted longer than a century. What was the verdict of that time which struck the noble fighters of God? Their name was rejected as a malicious one, and in every one of their weaknesses, which, of course, are also visible in the saints of God, one saw a sure proof of their allegedly ungodly disposition. But even today, rationalistic or indifferentistic church historians may still refer to the period of those disputes as a disgrace to Christianity and to those fighters as carnal zealots: all orthodox Christians rather look back to that period as the glorious period in which hell, having failed to drown the Church in her blood, mustered and gathered all her power to destroy with certainty the foundation of the Church, and so the Church herself, by falsifying the doctrine of the person of JESUS CHRIST, but in which the LORD still had faithful watchmen on the battlements of his Zion, who took the word of Strach to mean: "Defend the truth unto death, and the LORD will fight for thee" (4:33.), and who could say with David, "I have been almost jealous to death, that mine adversaries should forget thy words." (Ps. 119:139.) All orthodox Christians, therefore, continue to this day to bless the noble fighters of God, who did not grow weary in their struggle, and who did not regard that for the sake of their relentless fight, often seemingly for hair-splitting trifles, "always

than a curse of the world and a sacrifice of all people"; for who can calculate the blessing which this victorious struggle of theirs has brought to the whole world until the last day? Of the Athanasian Symbolum, therefore, which contains in brief words the spoils of that struggle, Luther says: "The Symbolum of St. Athanasii is so composed that I do not know whether anything more important and glorious has been written in the church of the New Testament since the time of the apostles." (On Joel 2, 28. VI. 2314.) *)

But, saith one, according to the word of God, shall not all things be done in love? 1 Cor. 16, 14. We answer: Yes, indeed! But although we readily admit that we are still far from the goal of doing, saying, and writing everything in love, even in polemics, and that even in us an emotion sometimes interferes that cannot stand the divine test of true, full love without all admixture, we can nevertheless confess to the glory of Him who has worked faith in us through His Word and His Holy Spirit that this is our goal, which we pursue with all earnestness. But we can confess to the glory of him who has worked faith in us through his word and his Holy Spirit, that this is our goal, which we pursue with all earnestness, whether we wish to attain it. As much as we know ourselves, we have no unkind, spiteful disposition toward any of those against whom we have ever written; rather, we wholeheartedly wish all our opponents all temporal and eternal prosperity; we can for them

*The first who made it his unfortunate business, within the Protestant Church, to search out with great care every little spot to be discovered in all the advocates of the pure doctrine, not only in his own time, but also in the old Church, nay, to report what the enemies of truth had imputed to them, if not as established truth, yet as very credible, was Gottfried Arnold. While he assumes the role of a palliative advocate of all heretics, false spirits, and enthusiasts, he sets out, on the other hand, to portray the orthodox, wherever he can, as unconverted, quarrelsome zealots. In order to achieve this, among other things, with Athanasius, he does not disdain to cite even the testimony of the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus! His so-called "unpartheistic church and heresy history" is the exact opposite of an unpartheistic church-historical work, which is why he is considered by all indifferentists of our time to be the first critical church historian of our church. It is true that immediately after the publication of his work, his partisan falsifications of history were proven to him so often and so irrefutably that he himself seems to have felt many painful pangs of conscience about them later. But for fear that it would damage the reputation of his work, he, like all dishonest spirits who nevertheless want to be considered saints, never publicly recanted. That he was, however, beaten in his conscience is shown by a private letter of Arnold's addressed to Pfanner from Quedlinburg on Nov. 1, 1700, which is preserved in the princely library at Gotha and is included by Georg Grosche in his "Defense of the Protestant Church" (Preface XV.). A. writes: "I do not deny or excuse the harsh tract against the Orthodox as a previous weakness, but I assure you that "these last five years since I wrote this, I have been freed from it and such things have been extinguished and done away with in the blood of the Lamb. - And yet Arnold allowed his work, unfilled with distortions and vituperations of theologians who had been zealous for the doctrine, in which he does not leave even a Luther untapped, to go forth again and again almost unchanged. Let us hope that the man worthy of regret sought and found forgiveness for this "in the blood of the Lamb" even in the hour of his death.

We would be unspeakably glad to be able to shake their hands as brothers won for the truth, and all the harm they might have done to us would leave no wound in our hearts. Even if we sometimes make harsh attacks, we do so neither because we exalt ourselves above our adversary in our hearts, nor in order to gleefully cause him a slight or public embarrassment, nor because we regard him as our personal enemy or even as an enemy of the truth and of God; but only because in this way we think we can awaken our erring adversary to the consciousness of his error and save unsuspecting Christians from the dangerous error of the same. We ourselves are often convinced, even in the face of harsh attacks, that our opponent is *bona fide* in error. Or is it impossible that the most intimate love should walk about in a rough garment, while love-lessness wraps itself in sweet speeches? Does not the Lord himself call an erring Peter in the most ardent love a Satan, while a poisonous Judas betrays his best friend in heaven and on earth with a kiss? Do not think, then, that a serious struggle for the unadulterated truth of the divine word must necessarily imply a denial of the love of one's brother or neighbor; this love may exist after all, only the struggle waged in spite of it shows that one loves Christ more than one loves one's brother and neighbor. Luther therefore writes so beautifully from the Wartburg to Wolfg. Fabricius Capito: "Summa, let it remain so: My love is ready to die for you; but he who stirs faith touches the apple of our eye. Here stands love, which you may mock or honor" (that is, believe that we really love you, or only have love in your mouths and pretend), "as you will; but faith, or the word, you shall worship and hold for the most holy! This is what we want from you: to our love give yourselves all you want; but fear our faith in all things! God keep thee, my dear Fabrici, and doubt not that my heart is righteous toward thee. Thou thyself seest that the matter is great and holy. According to this we must judge, lest we prefer our brothers and sisters to Christ." (XIX, 669.)

But, speak, do you not often become all too personal? Why do you not always stick to the matter in hand, according to the old saying: "Friend of the person, enemy of the matter"? We answer: it is quite possible to be a friend of the person and yet attack the person, and in some circumstances harshly. What is the Christian order of fraternal punishment according to Matt. 18 but a divine order to attack the person also, and that, where necessary and possible, to the point of banishment, according to which the person is to be regarded "as a heathen and a publican"? And did not the prophets, the apostles, and Christ himself also often attack certain persons, and severely, very severely?

Even then, as was the case with those saints of God and especially with the Lord Himself, the attack must have its source in love for God and neighbor. But if the person who spreads error reveals himself to be dishonest; if, for example, he is, publicly overcome, only apparently yields for the moment in order to be able to come forward in his own time with the error; or when he really abhors the error, but does not want to have had it, and "attributes" everything, even the clearest earlier manifestations of the error, to misunderstood expressions; or if he tries to cause confusion of language, gives a good meaning to ambiguous terms, an evil meaning to those that signify good, so as to fish in the mud, keep the error under ambiguous terms, and so sail at will under the flag of orthodoxy and irreligion, and yet be able to pass for orthodoxy, and the like: Then, however, the mask must be ruthlessly pulled off such a dishonest person; for such dishonest people are more dangerous than the grossest enemies and blasphemers of the truth. If, however, blasphemy is added to this, there can be no doubt that the polemic must also be directed with divine earnestness against the persons.

We cannot refrain from having our German prophet speak about this again. After he had admonished and punished Cardinal Albrecht, Archbishop of Mainz, who resided in Halle, in writing with great seriousness, for having set up a new indulgence system in Halle and for having proceeded with great severity against those priests who married, the Cardinal answered Luther in the most humble terms, but nevertheless continued in his archiepiscopal manner. *) Hereupon Luther, as he had threatened, issued an exceedingly sharp writing against the Cardinal, in spite of all the entreaties of Capito, who had persuaded the Cardinal to write so humbly only to appease Luther. Luther writes about this to Capito and others as follows (XII, 662. f.):

"You write that you have invented a different way from ours of spreading and promoting the gospel. What is this but that either your opinion or mine is wrong, though the Spirit's office must not in the least be contrary to it? For St. Paul also commanded the Corinthians Titum, 2 Cor. 12:18, because he walked in the same footsteps with him.

But for the sake of my favour to thee, I would gladly have assuaged this word, which I say 'another way,' if thou wouldst let me have it by thy own interpretation.

*) In his answer to Luther, so that he would not write against him, the Cardinal had used the following humble expressions: "I will, if God wills, keep and show myself in such a way as is due to a pious, spiritual and Christian prince, as much as God gives me grace, strength and reason. Wherefore I also faithfully ask, and will ask. For I am not able of myself, and confess that I am in need of God's grace; how then I am a poor sinful man, who can sin and err, and sin and err daily, I do not deny, etc. (Luther XIX, 661.)

do not force yourself to understand it as you say: The gospel would be continued if great lords were held in good stead, looked through the fingers, spared, excused their (evil) deeds, and (as your words read) held us in such a way that we did not arouse a war with severe punishment and words of reproach.

This opinion of yours is, in my opinion, a real hypocrisy and denial of Christian truth. I would not wish my enemies to like this opinion of yours, let alone wish the gospel to be promoted in this way. Summa, there is nothing more violent to me than this very opinion. And Christ help, not that thou doest nothing, but that thou be so preserved with us that thou doest no harm.

Thou desirest meekness and gentleness; I confess it. But what fellowship can a Christian have with a hypocrite? Christianity is a publicly sincere thing; it acknowledges and confesses things as they are in themselves. The heathen also wish all misfortune on those who approve of their friends' sin and vice; how then should the truth approve of Christ's vice and ungodliness?

But we also will make known our opinion unto thee, and confidently declare it unto thee, and unto all the world, and without all timidity, notwithstanding that thou writest, that the common people are offended, when they bite so hard. For whom did Christ not offend, or whom did he not punish? The Spirit of truth also punisheth, and flattereth not: but he punisheth not certain persons only, but the whole world.

Therefore this is our opinion, that everything should be dragged about, punished, brought to shame, nothing spared, nothing seen through the fingers, nothing excused, that the truth may stand clear and public on the open plan.
But it is another thing, that if thou receive those whom thou hast punished with right gentleness, thou bear with them, and provoke them to good. This, then, belongs to the example of Christian love, as the ministry of preaching does, as Christ teaches in Luc. 24:47, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name. For Christ also, after he had punished every man most severely, desired to be a clucking hen, that he might gather them under his wings. Matth. 23, 37. Luc. 13, 34. Love bears all things, trusts all things, hopes all things, endures all things. 1 Cor. 13, 7. But faith, or the word, suffers nothing at all, but punishes and restrains itself; or as Jeremiah Cap. 1, 10. says, Tear out, break, destroy, perish. Jer. 48:10: Cursed be he that doeth the work of the LORD unadvisedly.

It is another thing, my dear Fabrici, to praise or belittle vice; and another thing to cure it with goodness and kindness. Let it be said first of all what is right and what is wrong, and then, when the

If a hearer has accepted such a thing, he is to be tolerated, and as Paul says, Rom. 14,1: to receive the weak in faith.

But your opinion makes the truth never known, and yet nothing less, because of such false hypocritical kindness, is considered as if the harm were healed. Thus is fulfilled the saying of Jeremiah, Cap. 8, 11: They comfort my people in their calamities, that they should esteem them little. And again Cap. 23, 14: They strengthen the wicked, lest any man turn from his wickedness.

I do not hope that we have ever behaved ourselves in such a way that we could be accused of lacking the love to receive and tolerate the weak; nor do we lack meekness, kindness, peace, and joy if someone accepts our word, even if he cannot soon be fully satisfied. For we are content, if he only knows the truth, and does not resist it, or condemn it. What we do afterward is a work of Christian love, which admonishes him to do that which he has known.

If he, your Cardinal, had written the letter from the heart, dear God, how gladly, how humbly would we fall at his feet, and not think ourselves worthy to kiss the dust of his feet? Are we not also dust and a foul pit of sin? If he but receive the word, we will serve him as servants. But to those who despise, cunningly persecute, and condemn the doctrine and ministry of the word, we have neither grace, love, nor favor. Although the highest love is to resist their ungodly ravings with all one's strength in every way and manner.

Now, if you have instructed your Cardinal in such a way that he has become such a fine critic, you yourself see that we should not be moved by him at all. But you will not be able to deceive us, since we also know the thoughts of the devil, and can justify and condemn each one from his words.

Your Cardinal writes that he wants to do with God's help what is due to a pious, spiritual, and Christian prelate. If he says this in good faith, and you have not instructed him, then your heart is truly of such a mind that he will lay aside his cardinal's robes and episcopal pomp, and go to the ministry of the word. But who shall persuade us to believe this?

It is impossible that he should preside over so small a parish; but it is hard that he should give up his office, and become a priest. Sayest thou, who would desire such a thing of him? Answer: How then wilt thou be content and secure, if thou wilt not shew him this truth? Lift him up after this, and see through the fingers. But first of all, think thou to shew him, that he may know wherein he sinneth or sinneth not.

Can. Then also be diligent that he sin not; or if he have sinned, forbear him. But if he has sinned ungodly, you must neither tolerate it nor hold it against him, whether it is fabricated by Christian or human virtue. For this is the evil, even the cruel hypocrisy, which you yourself have falsely invented by Christian or human piety.

Further, how can I also believe that you write: the married priest has been dismissed; yet your Cardinal writes: the cause of writing my booklet has long since been dismissed. A fine dismissal indeed. Had he rather been put to death... Thou hast forced him to conspire with his wife, against his conscience, whereof he is now in sadness. For God's love, will you try the Holy Ghost? Will you not yet cease to persevere in the persecution of priestly marriage, because you do not yet revoke the forced conspiracy and tyranny of divorce, for which you have given cause? ... Do you look for such a man at Luther, who will see you through the fingers to all that you intended, if he alone is smeared with a letter of flattery? Because ye are in such unspeakable wickedness, and are not content that we should be ready to forgive you, and to bear with you for love's sake.

Why do you also ask us to justify you, that is, to be so ungodly as to deny the doctrine? You tempt me, my Fabrici, much enough, and more than enough. I answer you kindly enough, and more than enough, though you ought to have answered more sharply, because you continue in your doings, mocking and laughing at them, and also, as you seem to think, with very glittering colors, but in my opinion with very foolish colors.

We will defend the divine doctrine with all our strength, whether heaven or hell be angry. Therefore, in Luther, as before, you always have a submissive, obedient servant, insofar as you hold divine doctrine dear; but on the other hand, a free despiser, where you and your Cardinal will continue to make a mockery of God's Word." -

Luther wrote to Spalatin as early as 1521 about how necessary even the greatest sharpness is against obdurate blasphemers:

"Neither Capito's nor Erasmus's judgment affects me in the least. Therefore their writings, which refrain from scolding, biting, and annoying, are of no consequence at all. For popes, who are politely reminded, think that their fox-tails are being cut off, and, as if they had the power to remain unimproved, they persist, and are satisfied that "one must fear them and" no one may dare to punish them. Therefore I fear and am very afraid in my conscience, that I have departed from your counsel and that of other friends at Worms, and have kept some of my spirit, and have not presented a right Eliam to the idols. They should hear it otherwise if I were again set before them." (XV, Anh. 158. f.) Far be it, then, that Luther should not have kept his cool-

If he should have repented of his appearance in Worms in the sense that he had punished too freely there, it rather caused him great remorse for many years to come that he had let his pious friends dampen his spirit in Worms.

We know, of course, that we are not Luther, who could or should act in Luther's way; but the principles which Luther followed in his polemics are correct; these principles must and will therefore, s. G. w., guide us also in the future.

If we ourselves are finally asked about our "legitimation" to also proceed in an aggressive manner, our answer is brief: our legitimation for this is our baptism. Or is it not the duty of a baptized man to confess his Lord for his glory, and to punish his brother and neighbor for his salvation? "*In publicos hostes omnis homo miles est*" (against public enemies every man is a soldier), says, by the way, Tertullian quite rightly in this respect (*Apol. c.* 2.); but every false teacher is a *publicus hostis,* and surely we also belong to the *omnis homo*.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.
(Continued.)

§ 27.

Although the so-called Confirmation is an adiaphoron, not of divine institution, much less a sacrament, yet it is such an ecclesiastical institution, which, if rightly used, can be accompanied by great blessings; therefore the preacher, where it has fallen into disuse, must see to its reintroduction, and, where it exists, maintain it.

Annotation.

Deyling writes of this: "Confirmation is a very old usage; it used to be given immediately after baptism, both to infants and adults, when a bishop was present, who said solemn prayers for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the newly baptized, and followed it with anointing with the laying on of hands and the sign of the cross. This was followed by the anointing with the laying on of hands and the sign of the cross. Therefore the whole act was called Chrisma (anointing), Cheirothesia (laying on of hands) and Sphragis (seal), which names were much better known than the name of the Confirmation itself. Thus Tertullian writes: 'Having come from baptism, we receive holy unction'. And: "After this the hand is laid upon us, and the Holy Spirit is invoked and implored to bless us". (*De bapt. c*. 7. 8.) In the oldest times, therefore, confirmation was by no means a special

The first is not really a sacrament so called, and distinct from baptism, but nothing else than a ceremony of baptism, and, as it were, an appendage of it. *) In the course of time this rite began to be separated from baptism and to be performed separately. It consisted mainly in the examination of the adult, in the repetition of the baptismal covenant, and in a renewed commitment and pledge that the baptized person would persevere in the covenant made with God and in the true faith. Afterwards the Popes made a sacrament out of this rite, which is to be received by all who have passed the seventh year, and the effect of which, as they say, is to impart grace, which in certain respects is greater than the grace of baptism, namely, to strengthen the soul against the attempts of the devil and to imprint an indelible character, by which man is entered into the host of Christ. But all of this is pure fiction, as M. Chemnitz, in his examination of the Tridentine Council, and others, have evidently shown. Among the Protestants, with the rejection of the papist Sacrament of Confirmation, as a superstitious rite, a certain kind of solemn Confirmation is retained in many places; †) This is very recommendable, since it is purified of all superstition; reintroduced after the fact from the early Church, it tends to precede the first use of Holy Communion and has no small benefit. For children, when they have grown up a little and have been sufficiently instructed in Christian doctrine, before they are admitted to the Lord's Supper for the first time, lay down their first sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Before they are admitted to Holy Communion for the first time.

---

*Guericke writes in his Archaeology: "Already early on, immediately after baptism, the newly baptized, *neophyti,* were anointed on various parts of the body with the consecrated Chrismatic oil, as a symbol of the spiritual priesthood of all Christians; also at the same time - and this already on the basis of apostolic practice, Apost. 8, 16. 17. - blessed by the laying on of hands, as a sign of religious consecration and the impartation of the Spirit. This laying on of hands was at first the integrating final act of baptism itself. Since the 2nd and 3rd centuries, however, (since which time the Chrismatic anointing has also been added) the importance of this act was especially emphasized, and therefore (just as, according to Acts 8, it was only performed by the apostles themselves after baptism had already been performed by others) the authority to do so was soon regularly granted only to the bishops, even if not yet without exception. Since, however, the bishops by no means always administered baptism, the laying on of hands with the Chrismatic anointing began, in the 3rd century, to be regarded as a special act of *Confirmatio,* as an episcopal act; a separation from baptism, which was, of course, furthered by the laying on of hands, which was soon given to most heretics who converted to the Catholic Church, normally without a new baptism. Only where the bishop himself baptized, baptism and imposition of hands remained united in one act; otherwise he conferred the latter on those baptized abroad by country or other ecclesiastics on diocesan occasion as the *signaculum*, αφραγίς." (2nd ed., p. 269. k.)

†) Luther speaks out against the papal "confirmation" as early as the 1st of 1520 in the Scripture on the Babylonian Prison of the Church (XIX, 111 ff.) and in the Church Postil, in the other interpretation of the Epistle on Christ's Day (XII, 192). In the sermon on conjugal life of 1522, he calls it a "monkey game" and a "right lie" (X, 715.), "the bishop's idols' lying jugglery." (S. 745.)

The members of the church, who are in the midst of the church assembly, give a test of their progress in the Christian religion and renew their confession of faith. Thereupon they are publicly prayed for and after receiving the blessing they are dismissed in peace as those who now have the next claim to the Holy Communion. See the Mansfeldische Agende Cap. 17. under the heading: 'Of the Confirmation of Children who have recited the Catechism and are now to be admitted to the reverend Sacrament.'" (*Institut. prud. pastoral*. Ill, 3, 40. pag. 390-393.)

Since our church did not reject Confirmation per se, but only the papist superstition attached to it (see Apology, Art. 13.), it happened that Bugenhagen, with Luther's approval, introduced a purely Protestant Confirmation in Pomerania, which example was soon followed in the Churches of Churbrandenburg, Strasbourg, Hesse, and elsewhere. Therefore, in the Protestants' answer to the submission to the Regensburg Colloquium in 1541, it says: "There is neither divine command nor promise concerning Confirmation and Holy Orders; and those who know of the opposite, know that these customs are only remaining indications of the ancient gifts of the Holy Spirit; for in the beginning of the churches, the manifest gifts of the Holy Spirit were bestowed on the people when the apostles laid their hands on them. So also the prophets and apostles healed diseases and pestilences with prayers, ointments, and other medicines. From this beginning the customs still remain. But how they are and are kept at this time is in the day. But we would have the Catechism practiced faithfully in the churches, and that, after the children have heard and confessed their faith, and have promised obedience to the church, there should be prayer over them. And this prayer, we believe, would not be in vain; nor do we dislike that the laying on of hands should be used for it, as it is held in some of our churches." (S. Luther's Works XVII, 879.)

However, Confirmation did not become a general institution in our church in the 16th century; indeed, despite the fact that M. Chemnitz recommended it so urgently in his *examination*, it came more and more into decline, especially during the confusion caused by the Thirty Years' War, even where it had originally existed. One of the first to call attention to this institution and its blessings was Dr. J. Quistorp, professor of theology and antist at the church of St. Jacob in Rostock. He had "*Pia desideria*" printed in 1659, with a recommending preface by the theological faculty of Rostock, of which the ninth *desiderium* deals with "the confirmation of the catechumens. Quistorp says about this: "Once upon a time, baptized Christian children, because at that time they had not made the confession of their faith before the church themselves, were publicly presented again by their parents or, in their place, by their godparents, when they entered adolescence, and they were then examined by the church.

The boy was examined by the bishop according to the catechetical rules in use at that time. Finally, after the laying on of hands, the boy was released with solemn blessing and confirmation of his faith. If this highly praiseworthy ecclesiastical discipline were to be practiced today, it would undoubtedly spur the concern of many parents and godparents who so surely neglect the instruction of their children as if it were a matter of no concern to them, which they then could not refrain from doing without public embarrassment. The unity of faith would be greater in Christendom, and the indolence of most would not be so great, and therefore not so many would easily be seduced by heresies." (S. Varior. auctor. miscellanea th. collegit J. Glob' Pfeiffer. Lips. 1736 p. 101. f.) For more general.

As is known, since 1666 Spener has been active before others in introducing the confirmation celebration. *) Löscher also calls it "a praiseworthy and edifying ceremony," but adds: "but it cannot be introduced everywhere, nor is it absolutely necessary." (Unschuld. Nachrr., Jahrg. 1713, p. 694. f.)

§ 28.

The preacher has the duty to prepare those who want to be confirmed by a thorough instruction in the catechism, and then to perform the act according to the instructions of an orthodox agenda.

Note 1.

The Constitution of the Missouri Synod speaks of this as follows: "The District Synod shall see to it that its preachers only grant confirmation to the catechumens if they can at least recite the text of the catechism by heart without interpretation and have been taught the understanding of it to such an extent that they are able to examine themselves according to 1 Cor. 11:28. The Synod demands that more able catechumens be brought, wherever possible, to the point where they can substantiate the doctrines of the Christian faith with the clearest proofs from Scripture and refute the false doctrines of the sects. Where possible, one hundred hours are to be spent on confirmation classes. The preacher must also see to it that his confirmands memorize a good number of such good church core songs.

*) In the year 164t the Superintendent and Professor of Theology Dr. Christian Große in Stettin, later General Superintendent in Pomerania, died 1673, wrote the following scripture (which unfortunately we have not been able to get hold of): "*Evangelica liberorum confirmatio*, i.e. a thorough report on how the confirmation or blessing of children in our Protestant churches can and should be held. Stettin, 1641." 4 Polycarp. Leyser, in his continuation of Chemnitz' Protestant Harmony, says of Matth. 19:13: "For the sake of the papal antics added to confirmation in the papacy (the chrism and cheek prank), the whole act of confirmation was abolished in the beginning of the Protestant Reformation; the child was thrown away with the unclean bath."

which can serve as a gift for the rest of their lives."

Note 2.

As far as the age required to receive confirmation is concerned, the completion of the 12th year is usually the earliest. Luk 2, 41.42. Adults who are not confirmed, especially those who are already married, should be free to choose if they want to be publicly confirmed; but in any case they should first receive confirmation instruction before they are admitted to Holy Communion.

Note 3.

According to ancient custom, the time of Confirmation is either Palm Sunday or Quasimodogeniti Sunday. The former is particularly suitable because the preparation for the first part of Holy Communion is part of the character of Protestant Confirmation. Sunday Quasimodogeniti, however, is especially suitable because, according to ancient custom, on this day the newly baptized were "formally incorporated into the congregation by solemn presentation, after which they took off their white baptismal robes; hence this Sunday of the Paschal Octave itself dominica in albis, χυριαχη *iv λευχοΐς* (the Day of the Lord in White Clothes), dies novorum, octava infantium, dies neophytorum; later, with a cognate meaning, in the Occident, according to the Divine Introit Pet. 2, 2., was called Quasimodogeniti ('as the little children now born')." (Guericke's Archaeology, p. 175.) - To select a high feast day, e. g. the second Pentecost holiday, as some do, for this purpose, seems unsuitable, in that thereby the celebration of God's great deeds is necessarily impaired.

Note 4.

The preacher must be careful not to present Confirmation as an act supplementing and completing the baptism received in unconscious infancy, as if, for example, the confirmand now had to make the confession and vows pronounced by the godparents "his own. Rather, the act of confirmation should serve above all to bring to the vivid remembrance, both of the confirmands and of the whole congregation present, the glory of the baptism already received in childhood. *)

Note 5.

The condition for the granting of Confirmation cannot be the certainty that the catechumen is a true believer.

*It is one of the not so rare aberrations of those who want to be considered strictly Lutheran, ecclesiastical, before others. Cf. the review of an essay from Vilmar's "pastoral-theol. Blättern", which, taken from the Erlanger Zeitschrift, is found in "Lehre und Wehre" Jahrg. VIII, p. 110-116.

But notoriously wicked children, if all faithful application of God's word is of no avail, should just as little be confirmed, and so knowingly uselessly take God's name, as such are not to be admitted to confirmation and to the Lord's table,' who are still so ignorant that they are not able to examine themselves according to 1 Cor. 11:28.

Note 6.

On the Sunday before Confirmation, the confirmands are to be urgently recommended from the pulpit to the intercession of all Christians, especially their parents, godparents and relatives.

Note 7.

About the whole Confirmation celebration compare the form found in the Agende of the Synod of Missouri etc.. News of the introduction of Confirmation in the Count Pappenheim churches in 1732 and the beautiful form presented for the first celebration of the same is given by Löscher in his "Unschuld. Nachrichten" year 1733, p. 621 - 626.

(To be continued.) ----------

The fertility of error.

This is how Johann Gerhard writes about this subject:

What we see happen to a wanderer is that, when he strays a little from the right path, he continues to stray until, at last, he finds himself on impassable mountain slopes or in the dens of wild beasts and, perceiving his course, either returns to the right road or plunges himself into ruin: The same thing is wont to happen to men in the course of this life, that, when they have deviated from the royal path of heavenly doctrine, they fall from one error into another, and, if they do not, enlightened by light from above, turn in time to the royal path of universal truth, plunge themselves into eternal ruin, being compelled to misinterpret many things, if they do not wish to understand the one thing aright. Chrysostom explains this in his interpretation of Gal. 1 by means of another comparison: just as he, he writes, who cuts off something of the image stamped on a royal coin makes the whole coin false money, so he who distorts even a small part of the sound doctrine of faith falsifies it completely, and after he has made this beginning, he proceeds to worse and worse things. Luther likes this comparison: "If Satan is able to get articles granted to him in one, he has won, and is just as much as if he had already lost them all, and Christ; he can also destroy and take others after that; for they are all wound and closed into one another, like a golden chain, so that, where Satan has lost all the articles in one, he has lost all the articles in another.

If one link is dissolved, the whole chain is dissolved, and everything is separated. And there is no article that he cannot overthrow, if he can bring it to pass that reason falls in and wants to cleverly, and then knows how to finely twist and stretch the writing so that it rhymes with it. *) A living example of this is offered us by the previous and present centuries in the followers of Zwingli and Calvin. For after they had first denied the true, real, and supernatural presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Communion, they were now in the habit of denying it. For after they had first denied the true, real, and supernatural presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion, they fell from this one error into several others. When our own pointed out that, according to the words of the institution, the will of Christ, the God-man, was manifest, but that there could be no doubt about his power among those who believed that Christ was the almighty Son of the almighty Father, the opponents replied, "that God, with all his power, could not cause his body to be substantially present in several places at once." (Thus Peter Martyr, in his Dialogue. *Dialogue, de pantachusia,* 6. The Zurichers in reply to Brenzens Testament fol. 94. the colloquents of the counterpart in the colloquium at Mömpelgard.

33) Thus the integrity of the article was shaken by God. In support of the absence (of the body and blood of Christ) the opponents adduced the evidence of the ascension of Christ. Our opponents replied that the Ascension was followed by sitting at the right hand of the Father, through which Christ was granted all authority in heaven and on earth, and complete dominion over all things, so that it was quite easy for him to perform what he had promised. Then the opponents began to dispute against the granting of the attributes, and the sitting at the right hand of God was declared to be from a special place in heaven. (Thus Bullinger in his Tractate von den Worten des Abendmahls. Beza in his Theology Vol. I, 601.) Thus the integrity of the article of Christ's person was shaken. When ours urged the eating of the unworthy, which Paul asserted in express words, and proved from it the true and real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy supper, they answered, "I am the Lord. The opponents replied that the ungodly, who lack true repentance and true faith, do not partake of Christ's body and blood in Holy Communion, either spiritually (which is true) or sacramentally. The Holy Communion, since they are rejected by the absolute decision of God and are not redeemed by Christ's blood. (Colloq. on Mömpelgard fol. 717. Zanchi in his Miscellanea fol. 307.) Thus the integrity of the article of predestination was shaken. When, in order to prove the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Communion, the distinction between the body and the blood of Christ was made, it was not possible to make a distinction. When, in order to demonstrate the presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion, the difference between the sacraments of the Old and New Testaments was asserted by ours, because the latter only administered the

*) From Luther's Sermon on Christian Armor and Weapons of 1532. IX, 450.

The opponents answered that the sacraments of the Old and New Testaments were the same in their nature, but that they differed only by certain accidents, namely, by the signs and ceremonies, by the manner of signification, by duration, generality, distinctness, etc. (Orthodox Consent 63 Bucanus, Locus 60.) Thus the integrity of the article of sacraments was shaken. (Thus the orthodox consensus 63rd Bucanus in 46th Locus 603.) Thus, then, the integrity of the article of the Sacraments was shaken. Since ours urged that the outward symbols in the Sacraments of the New Testament did not signify, but presented heavenly things, and proved this by the example of Baptism, which is a bath of regeneration and renewal Tit. 3, 5.Not a mere sign of it, answered the opponents, that baptism is the washing away of sins, and the bath of regeneration, these are inauthentic and figurative modes of speech; the real mode of speech is this, that it is a sign of the washing away of sins. (Thus Beza in his answer to Mömpelgard's Colloquium II, 115. Ursinus in his Compendium 532.) Thus, then, the integrity of the article of baptism was shaken. In order to substantiate that the sacramental analogy consisted only in signification, the opponents made use of the proof of the breaking of the bread: as the breaking of bread signifies Christ's crucifixion, so the bread in the Holy Communion signifies Christ's body. Communion signifies Christ's body. Our opponents replied that Christ, in administering the first supper, did not break the bread for the sake of representation, but for the sake of distribution, for which purpose the bread, which had not been broken in pieces, was prepared by this action; thus arose the controversy about the necessity and purpose of the breaking of bread. Many others arose from these errors.

How many errors has that conclusion of absolute rejection alone given birth to in the school of the opponents? From that principle the dogmas have undoubtedly flowed: That God has predestined some men not only to damnation, but also to the causes of damnation, that is, to sins; that the will of the sign is different from the will of pleasure, the revealed will from the hidden will; When God testifies in his word that he wants all to be helped and to come to the knowledge of the truth, this is to be understood of the will of the sign and of the revealed will, but another and different is the will of benevolence and the hidden will, according to which God, by virtue of his absolutely free will that precedes all causes, has condemned the greatest part to eternal damnation absolutely and absolutely; that Christ did not die for the sins of all men; that the promises of the gospel are not general; that all things are done by necessity and according to an unchangeable counsel of God; that men are not to be condemned by God to eternal damnation.

That the first man fell by necessity; that God created some to be eternally damned; that many are called by the word of whom God absolutely and badly does not wish to come; that the power of conversion and beatification is not to be ascribed to the word and the sacraments; that true faith itself is not lost by sins against the conscience, and so on. This is the long train of errors which that single conclusion of absolute rejection entails. The same may be easily shown by the other pieces; how fruitful, indeed, error is, and does not cease where it began; from which it may easily be seen that that system of absolute reprobation is not the golden chain of salvation, but rather the ruin-bringing cord of despair. For, what can they (Calvinists) present for the comfort of a man who is in anguish on account of his sense of sin, or who complains of the weakness of his faith, or whom the thoughts of reprobation disquiet? Will they refer him to the infinite mercy of God? But the challenged man will oppose that dreadful counsel of reprobation (as Calvin himself calls it in his Institutions B. 3. Cap. 23. § 7.) against it. Or to the merit of Christ? But the contested man will reply that Christ alone died for the elect, but that he does not know whether he is among the number of the elect. Yes, if he has learned in the schools of the opponents that Christ's human nature alone, and not his person, suffered, he will reply from Calvin (A. a. O. B. 2. Cap. 17. § 1.), "I confess, if any one would set Christ par excellence and in himself against the judgment of God, he would be entitled to no merit, because in no man is any worthiness found which should merit for God." Or will they refer the challenged one to the calling by the Word? But the challenged man will reply that another calling is the inward calling, and another the outward calling; that, in fact, many are called outwardly by the word, whom God has rejected inwardly by an absolute decree, and of whom, therefore, he does not want them to come at all. Or on the promises of the gospel? But the challenged man will reply that these are not general, but apply only to the elect, that grace is offered only to some with the intention of sharing it with them. (As Piscator, in his Disputation on Predestination, Thes. 85.) Or to baptism, in which he is washed from sins, born again by the Holy Spirit, and brought into the covenant. Or to the baptism in which he was washed of sins, born again by the Holy Spirit, and received into the covenant of God? But the challenged man will reply from Beza's preface to the 1st Th. of his answer to the Mömpelgard Colloq. P. 24. that neither all children, nor any really born again at the moment of baptism, are born again.

but that the benefit of regeneration will only in its time, as God has ordained, succeed that act of baptism in the children by the hearing of the word; and from Piscator's answer to Hoffmeister, p. 88: "Even of the elect it is not true that God has assigned to them his covenant in circumcision." Or on the use of the holy. Or on the use of Holy Communion, which is instituted for the strengthening of faith? But from this they have long since banished the sacramental communion of the body and blood of Christ, leaving only an analogical presence, i.e., a presence of the far, far absent body of Christ! Or on the goodness of the Mediator of Christ? But they hold, indeed, that Christ alone is present according to the divine nature (which is a consuming fire), but that his human nature, according to which he is our brother, is as far removed from us as the highest heaven is from the lowest earth! Or on the sensation of faith? But the feeling of faith in our hearts often disappears, especially in the time of temptation; therefore the one who is tempted will conclude thus: I feel no faith, therefore I have no faith, therefore God does not want me to have faith, therefore I am in the number of the rejected. Or on the evidence of faith? But all the marks of faith, which are given by the opponents, may also be shown in others who have fallen from the grace of God; but now, according to the supposition of the opponents, these have never had the true faith: therefore no one can be sure that he has the true faith of the elect. Or on the ministry of the Word and Sacraments? But the contested man will answer from Beza's answer to the minutes of the Mömpelgard Colloquy, Th. 2. p. 116. "He reviles God himself who thinks that God attaches even the least of his divine power to either the men through whose mouth he speaks, or to the outward word of God himself, or to the sacramental signs, to renew men and preserve them to eternal life in Christ." - If, therefore, we want the integrity of the heavenly doctrine and the foundation and basis of our faith to be well preserved, we must have nothing whatever to do with syncretism, or disguise these errors as insignificant; rather, we must therefore fight valiantly for the truth with all our strength, by following the earnest exhortation of Origen (in his Homily on Gen. 4, towards the end): "We who are commanded to wage the wars of the Lord must sharpen against the enemies the sword of the Word of God and go forth to battle against them; girding our loins with truth, we must appear in battle array, and at the same time, seizing the shield of faith, catch their poisonous projectiles of war and hurl them back at them all the more eagerly. For such were the wars of the Lord, which David and the other patriarchs waged. It is necessary to stand firm against them for our brethren. For it is better that

die, than that they should rob and plunder some of my brethren, and make the children and babes in Christ their prisoners by crafty words and artifices." (Loc. theologic. Volum. IV. Epistol, dedicator. pag. 2. sqq. 2.

The resolutions of the General Church Meeting on the four items.

1. Communion with people of other faiths.

1. In the face of indiscriminate communion, we hold firmly to the principle that communion is to be regarded as church communion. False believers and those who err in fundamental articles are not to be admitted to the table of the Lord. And not only those persons themselves who come unworthily to the table of the Lord, but also those who invite them, are to be held responsible.

2. Every pastor, therefore, has the right and the duty to make the necessary examination of persons who wish to partake of Holy Communion, in order to decide whether they possess in doctrine and life the qualities required by Holy Scripture. This is indispensable when they are first admitted, and as often as may be necessary hereafter, so that in our church now, as once in the days of the Reformation, the assurance may apply: "It is not administered to those who are not first interrogated." (Augsburg Conf. Art. Ill, Ab. 3.)

3. Certainly, under God's blessing, the faith would be mightily lifted up, and a better practice introduced into the church, if the pastor could be more frequent, especially with the younger and less grounded, and exhort and instruct them in private conversation.

4. Our church today, as of old, lives in the hope that such people, "if rightly instructed in doctrine, will, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, turn to the infallible truth of the divine Word with us and our churches."

5. When our church confesses its faith, rejects heresies that contradict it, and condemns those who believe in error, it is not, to use its own words, "our will and opinion, today as it was in ancient times, that persons who err out of simple-mindedness and do not blaspheme the truth of the divine word, much less entire churches, should be condemned. (Preface to the Concordia Book.)

6. It is true in our church today, as it was ages ago, that "we are in no doubt at all that many pious, innocent people, even in the churches, who have not hitherto associated with us

who walk in the simplicity of their hearts, do not understand the matter rightly, and have no pleasure at all in the blasphemies against Holy Communion, as it is held in our churches according to the foundation of Christ and is unanimously taught by virtue of the words of his testament. (Ibid.)

7. Our church, therefore, today as before ages, imposes upon its theologians and all its pastors the duty "that they also duly remind and admonish from God's word those who err out of simplicity and ignorance of their souls' danger." (Ibid.)

8. Our Church confesses now, as it did before ages, that the holy universal Christian Church is primarily a communion, the inward bond of which is faith and the Holy Spirit in the hearts, and the outward sign of which is the pure Word and the administration of the Sacraments according to the same. Our Church confesses now, as of old, that the holy common Christian Church is principally a communion, the inward bond of which is faith and the Holy Spirit in the hearts, and the outward sign of which is the pure Word and the administration of the Sacraments according to the same, and "that the catholic (common Christian) Church sends itself together from all nations under the sun. The church is the communion of saints, namely, the multitude or congregation professing one gospel, and having one Holy Spirit renewing, sanctifying, and governing their hearts." (Apol. Art. IV.)

9. On the one hand, then, our Church confesses today, as it did ages ago, amid all the clamor of rationalism and sectarianism, that the unalterable marks of the true Church are the pure Word of the Gospel and the Sacraments, and that the Church alone which has these is actually a pillar of truth, for it retains the pure Gospel, the right ground, as St. Paul says, and that is the right knowledge of Christ and the right faith in Him.

2. Pulpit Fellowship.

1. We are of the opinion that with the greatest conscientiousness the pure doctrine should be watched over in our pulpits, and that no one should be admitted to our pulpits, whether he be called a Lutheran or whatever, of whom it is to be doubted whether he will preach the truth of the divine word according to the confession of our church.

2. Lutheran preachers may well preach in other churches where they are called to do so, provided that in doing so they do not compromise themselves (make themselves suspect) in any way, as those who have fellowship with false teachers and schismatics, or want to be limited in any way in the proclamation of the full divine truth.

3. Secret societies.

1. That an association or society should be "secret" may not in itself be immoral, but it may easily be abused, and in such a case great harm may be done in house, state, and church.

as has often been the case. Therefore we must give serious consideration to the question of whether the advantages which, in their opinion, are connected with the "secret societies" could not be obtained in some other way which would be less exposed to abuse.

2. All and any societies for moral or religious purposes which are not founded on the Word of God in the Old and New Testaments and acknowledge its supreme authority; all who do not acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ as the true God and only Mediator between God and men; all who have doctrines, customs or forms of worship which are condemned in the Word of God and the Confession of His Church; all who usurp what God has entrusted to His church and its ministers; all who make oaths without a clear explanation and understanding of them, are unchristian, and we therefore earnestly warn our parishioners and preachers that they should have nothing to do with such associations.

3. We consider every connection with unbelieving and immoral associations to be utterly reprehensible, and believe that persons who participate in them should be taken with all firmness into church discipline, and if, after faithful, gentle, and patient admonition and instruction from God's Word, they obstinately and stubbornly persist in their sense, they should be excluded from communion (church fellowship) until they sincerely repent and refrain from such connection.

4. Finally, we would like to impress upon the hearts of our congregations how important it is that Christian charity be practiced on a larger scale out of a pure heart and uncolored faith, and especially that it is their sacred duty and obligation to make well-ordered systematic arrangements for the care of the sick and needy, widows and orphans.

4. Chili jam.

This Church Assembly adheres to the doctrine of the Second Coming of our Lord and the related articles concerning the last things, as set forth in the General Creeds and in the Augsburg Confession, in the sense in which these doctrines are undisputedly held by all who sincerely and unreservedly profess the Lutheran faith.

2. The General Church Assembly has no fellowship and does not want to have any fellowship with any synod that tolerates the "Jewish opinions" and "chiliastic errors" condemned in the 17th article of the Augsburg Confession.

3. But there are also points about which our confession is not explicit, and persons who are equal to each other in insight, honesty, and sincerity, and whose loyalty to the

Lutheran confession cannot be challenged, have not yet been able to agree on a completely consistent explanation of it. Such points should continue to be discussed calmly, on the basis of the Holy Scriptures and in prayerful looking upward, until we are in complete agreement about what the Word of God and the confession of our church teaches.

***

The Lutheran Standard comments on these decisions as follows: "There is much in this decision that gives us pleasure. Principles have been enunciated to which I am sure the hearty approval of all sincere Lutherans is due. But we would not meet the requirements of truth if we said nothing more. It is only too evident that, while a large part of the report adopted admits of an interpretation which would satisfy those who disagree with the Church Council on account of its position on the four points, the provisions are carefully formulated with a view to giving no offence to those who entertain other opinions. We are sorry to have to say this, for it has been our sincerest wish that everything in the Church Council should yet gain such a shape that all r.inen Lutherans could unite with it. But when a body condemns errors in general, and yet refuses to condemn the same errors in particular cases which occur within its own limits, this gives reason for some distrust. The sophistries with which it has been attempted to justify the refusal to apply the principles are too palpable to be able to appease a conscience once troubled. Certainly what was remarked in the debate is true, that the pastor in preaching does not name the persons guilty of the sins against which he preaches; but what would we think of a pastor who, after preaching God's wrath upon murderers, adulterers, drunkards, etc.? God's wrath, would leave it to the individual murderer, adulterer, drunkard, etc., to make the application himself, and who refuses to interfere with his relation to the church, whether he repent and amend or not? Such principles overthrow all discipline, in congregations as well as in synods. The declarations made in the report seem to exclude from our pulpits and altars all those who profess doctrines incompatible with the doctrines of our symbols, and yet eminent men of the Church Council have declared that they would not exclude all such. They must, therefore, have understood the report in a sense in which they did not consider themselves bound to exclude them. Chiliasts and people of secret societies may first decide for themselves before the Church Council whether their views and relations are in conflict with the Word of God, and the Church Council knows in advance what their decision is. This considerably diminishes

The resolutions of the General Church Meeting on the four points. 23 the joy which the principles adopted would otherwise have given us. But, the Church Council has done entirely as much in the right direction as we expected, and may yet do more."

The *Observer* says: "Accordingly, the four points have not been expressly and completely decided. The antichiliasts may find in one of the articles adopted the condemnation of chiliasm; the chiliasts may shelter themselves under the umbrella of another. The opponents of all secret societies will find the debate condemning the same satisfactory, while the advocates of the same may still retain Masons, Odd Fellows, etc., in their congregations, and remain untouched about them. That the pulpits are not to be exchanged with non-Lutherans at all may be brought out from the wording of the Declaration on this subject, but nevertheless the version is also capable of a construction which would permit a member of the General Council to invite a pastor of another orthodox denomination to preach in his pulpit. Closed communion is logically inevitable according to one of the claims on this point, and yet free communion can be just as logically defended according to other related discussions. The strictly symbolic Lutherans were at a disadvantage in several respects. They were almost all immigrants, and therefore compelled to present their views in German; their synods were only partially represented, and they were evidently in the minority from the beginning. But they had the wording of the 'fundamental principles' for themselves, supported by the historical construction of the symbolic books, as done by the extreme symbolists of Europe and America. Indeed, they entered into the discussion without evasion or circumlocution. They had accepted the 'principles' theoretically, and insisted on carrying them out practically to their lawful results, without regard to the possible consequences. We admired their frankness and honesty in advocating their side of the questions discussed, and regret that the reporter did not understand their remarks, and could not therefore reproduce them. It seemed to us, in some of the speeches of the Americans, that they made themselves, as they are wont to say, a straw-man, and then waited upon the same. They set up a sort of free communion, a sort of pulpit exchange, a genus of gross chiliasm, the admissibility of which we never heard even a General Synodist Lutheran advocate, and then stabbed at it quite horribly." -

Even the Reformed "Evangelist", as a result of the impressions received through the negotiations and declarations of the Church Council, states as his conviction: "After long deliberations, the less strict have won the day and enforced resolutions whereby communion and pulpit fellowship with irreligious believers, the abuses of the church, and the abuses of the church have been abolished.

The Church is not to be seen as a "church", but as a "society", where, while rejecting in general terms the societies and chiliastic heresies, the practice is left to the knowledge and conscience of the individual."

Litterary Intelligences.

1. Detailed Scriptural Explanation of the Two Articles of Holy Baptism and Holy Orders. Baptism and the Holy Communion. Holy Communion. By Johann Gerhard. After the original edition of 1610. 27½ sheets cl. 4. broch. 1-1/6 thlr. fine b. 1½ thlr. By Gustav Schlawitz in Berlin. -

The publisher announces this precious writing of Gerhard in German language as follows: To the Passion Book of Johann Gerhard, recently republished by us, we herewith add a new edition of another gem by the same, namely his: Detailed Scriptural Explanation of the Two Sacraments: Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which he was once prompted to edit by the Duchess Christine of Eisenach. He has solved this task in the present book in a rarely thorough and exhaustive manner. "Because," the author concludes the preface, "among those who all profess Christ and his word, there is much dispute and fencing about the two holy sacraments, I have, according to the small fortune that God has given me, the pure doctrine of holy baptism and holy chrismation. Baptism and the Holy Communion. I have wished to conduct the pure doctrine of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion unanimously and solely on the basis of the divine Word, to explain the seemingly contradictory parts of Scripture, and to instruct others who have been gifted with higher gifts to treat the other articles of the Christian religion in the same manner, which, according to my simple mind, would be done with peculiar benefit to the simple."

2. Wörterbuch zu M. Luthers Deutschen Schriften von Ph. Dietz in Marburg. Second delivery. (From memory - roof.) 24 sheets in 4. Geh. Price 1 Thlr.-

It gives us great pleasure to be able to present this work, which has just been published by F. C. W. Vogel in Leipzig. Which diligent reader of Luther's writings should not have felt the urgent need for such a dictionary? Although we have not yet been able to examine it ourselves, we hope that it will serve its purpose. We reserve the right to make a detailed announcement at a later date. W.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

The German ev.-Lutheran Synod of New York, of which Pastor Steimle is president, has not yet, as Pastor von Rohr writes, formally united with the Buffalo Synod of Rohr's faction, "as was erroneously asserted in the 'Doctrine and Defense' from the 'Evangelist,'" but the ministry of that Synod has now had to confess itself with the designated Buffalo Synod (we cite diplomatically exactly) "in cordial agreement, on the basis of pure symbolic doctrine of our church," "in opposition to the erroneous teachings of Missouri." Mr. Pastor von Rohr adds: "In this sense, their established theses were so framed that we could heartily confess the same." "Further, the Synod resolved that their officers should also attend our next Synod, in order to establish a nearer connection with the Synod at Buffalo, in a general Synod." The Theses on the Church and the Ministry, which have been communicated, do not at all contradict this kind of ecclesiastical union. At any rate, it is good, by the way, that the Synod of New York has thus given the larger public an opportunity to see its doctrinal position, which has hitherto been somewhat shrouded in mist. W.

Position of the Michigan Synod on the Four Points. From the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" of November 5, we learn that the Michigan Synod, at its recent meeting in Marshall, Mich., passed the following resolutions concerning the four points: "1. Since the congregational and ecclesiastical life of our Synod is in no way affected by chiliasm, we do not wish to make any further declaration concerning it than that set forth in the Confessions of our Church. In other words: "We reject chiliasm as it is rejected by the Augsburg Confession. Confession rejects it, and we leave free what it leaves free. (2) Concerning the mixed communion of the Lord's Supper, we declare that no one has a right to be admitted to our Lord's Supper who is found to be in opposition to our doctrine. (3) With regard to the exchange of pulpits, we declare that only those shall be admitted to our pulpits of whom we are fully convinced that they are not sectarians and that they preach the Word of God purely and unadulterated. With regard to secret societies, we declare that they are contrary to the spirit of Christ and true Christianity, and that we cannot understand how a true Christian can belong to them.

The dark brothers are having a very lively discussion about **foot washing,** as reported in the "Happy Messenger". They cannot agree on how to follow the example. Some want only one to wash and dry; others that one wash and another, girded with the apron, dry; still others, since the command is to wash and not to let wash, want all to wash. The former think that Christ's example requires that he who washes the feet should also be girded with the apron and dry, because this is what Christ did; others think that Christ's command, "As I have done to you, so shall you do to one another," permits two or more to share in the accomplishment of the example. They put the emphasis, "Ye shall do as I have done"; that is, two or more shall do as Christ alone did; hence it is according to the command, if one wash, and another, girded with the apron, follow and dry. Others may also take part in the example, in that one pours the water into the basin, and so on. Others again maintain that one should wash and dry the feet of another, so that all may have the opportunity to serve; for the meritorious or the worshipful lies not in letting wash, but in washing, and therefore each should not only have the opportunity to let wash, but rather also to wash.

Hierarchical. In the synodal report of the "German Lutheran Synod of the State of New York and other states" it says: "Hereupon came the painful matter of

of P. F. W. Spindler at Cohocton, Steuben Co., N. Y., for trial. As the same, notwithstanding a special summons, had not appeared at Synod, his case had to be undertaken without his presence. This was done in a serious and dignified manner, and the result on this point was the following unanimous synodal verdict: "That the former Rev. F. W. Spindler at Cohocton, Steuben Co, N. Y., has rendered himself unworthy of the sacred. He has proved himself unworthy and incapable of the holy office of preaching, and therefore should be deposed. He is therefore to be deposed from the holy preaching office." He only has the right of dismission who has the right of appointment. Since the synods are not the patrons of the congregations, who call the preachers for the congregations, the removal from office by the synod is an encroachment. The synod must exclude from the synod a preacher who is unworthy of the office, and the congregation must remove him from office.

Secret Societies. The "*Lutheran*" reports that the Old School Presbyterians at Blairsville have decided that no young man who is a member of a secret society can be a candidate for the preaching ministry.

What the "Reformirte Kirchenzeitung" states as the essence of the Reformed Church. It says in No. 911: "It does not seem right to us if one believes that the essence of the Reformed Church can be described in any individual doctrine, whether in the Calvinistic view of the Lord's Supper, or in the dogma of the election of grace or predestination. Rather, we can see the distinctive only in the fact that our church says r we have no doctrine at all, we merely adhere to the sacred Scriptures. Strictest adherence to the written Word of God is, as in all points, so also in doctrine, the decisive thing." After this declaration, of course, one is as wise as before it, for what sect will say of itself otherwise than, say, the papal?

Increase in Divorces. In Vermont, which is almost entirely inhabited by Americans, and whose population is stationary, the number of divorces grew from 91 in 1862 to 155 in 1866, or more than 70 per cent. Or, to make the moral conditions clear by a" comparison with the marriages contracted during 1862 to 1866, there were 593 divorces for every 11,400 marriages in the 5 years, or one divorce for every 19 marriages. In Connecticut the situation is even worse, in that in the last year there was 1 divorce for every 10 marriages. In Massachusetts the ratio in 1860 was 1 divorce for every 37 marriages, while 5 years before it was 1 to 44. Compared with Chicago, however, even Connecticut or Vermont still appear relatively moral. For while in Vermont in 1866 there were 155 divorces among 315,078 persons, or 1 divorce among 2302 persons, in Chicago in 1866 there were no less than 324 divorces among a population of 200,000.

The first general meeting of the Lutheran Association of the Gustav Adolf Foundation was held in Halberstadt on August 26 and 27. The foundation extends its effectiveness not only over all of Europe, but also over Africa and America, and its basic assets have reached the amount of 170,000 Thalers. From the report, which Dr. Fricke from Leipzig gave about the work of the association in the last year, we learn the following: In the last year of the Association, 783 needy Protestant congregations were supported with a total of 175,197 Thalers, and for 25 years 2798 congregations have been supported with 2,642,408 Thalers for church and school purposes. In the past year, 22 churches were consecrated and 12 new schoolhouses were occupied. There are 59 churches, 30 schools and 15 parsonages under construction, for which the help of the Association is being sought. Bequests and gifts flowed abundantly to the foundation, which now consists of 48 main, 1134 branch, 248 women's, 10 student and 9 independent associations. -The meetings were very animated by attractive lectures, and speakers from abroad: Hungary, France, Italy, Montevideo, etc., gave appropriate accounts of the situation of their communities. The love offering, to which all associations contributed, and which consisted of about 5000 Thalers, was granted to the Lutheran community of Schnikotzen in East Prussia. (Ref.-Kirch.-Ztg.)

The Church Council**.** That we are not blinded by partisanship when we declare the statements of the *Church Council* on the four points to be ambiguous and therefore un-Lutheran, un-theological, and suspicious, which can satisfy no sincere mind, is evidenced among other things by the "*Evangelical Lutheran*" of Charlotte in North Carolina. This has opened a controversy with the "*Lutheran and Visitor*" in its number of Dec. 10 of last year about the meaning of those declarations, in which the former says, among other things: "We had concluded that this article had been established for the special purpose of excluding fundamental errorists. .. But we had no thought that it could or should be enforced against preachers of other evangelical churches; for there are so many points of agreement between them and us, in which they preach 'the pure truth of the Word of God as taught in our churches,' (words of the *Church Council*) that there is no just cause to doubt that they will do otherwise. The lectures of such preachers may, to be sure, have a drnominational tinge, but it is hardly to be supposed that on such an occasion a subject would be chosen which might be in any degree offensive to sound Lutheran ears. We cannot believe that the construction which the '*Lutheran and Visitor'* gives of this article (that the Council rejects all pulpit changes with non-Lutherans) is the true opinion; but as it (the article) is somewhat ambiguous in its phraseology, justice to them, and to the Church at large, requires that the members of the *General Council, and* still more the '*Lutheran and Missionary,' which* is the recognized organ of that body, should determine the opinion of it more closely." Concerning the admission to Holy Communion The "*Evangelical Lutheran*" understands the statements of the *Council to* be as follows: "The first article on this point expressly states which are to be excluded; 'heretics and fundamental errorists. Now, if a member of another communion, known personally or by rumor to the minister or pastor, approaches the altar, the pastor or verger shall not be required to deny him the Holy Communion, whether he be a heretic or a fundamental errorist. For the knowledge which the preacher has of the life and character of such a man moves him to regard him as a Christian erring in 'simplicity,' and the refusal to admit him to the Lord's Table would be to 'condemn' him, and both in direct opposition to the doctrine of our confession. But the ninth or concluding article of the report, in our judgment, brings the whole matter to a close, or in other words, brings to the fellowship of communion all who truly love the Lord JEsus and are united to him by a living faith." - One can see from this that the "*Evangelical Lutheran*" understands the *Church Council*'s statements in a purely evangelical, unirreverent sense. He, too, in true American fashion, regards all non-Roman and non-Aryan denominations as good "evangelical-orthodox," and is likewise under the misapprehension that altar fellowship can take place even without church and confessional fellowship, as well as that the rejection of a member of an irreligious church from our communion involves a condemnation, a kind of banishment. W.

Congregationalists. The poor Germans have long been the most sought-after game among all, after which the local sects have hunted; Thanks to the "Evangelical Lutheran General Synod of the United States of North America," which has done next to nothing for the preaching of the Word of God to German-Lutheran immigrants, and has left this laborious and thankless business to the sects and later to the "dead formalists and ritualists," without, however, giving up its boast that everything good in the American Lutheran Church is already due to it and will be due to it in the future. Among the local sects searching for Germans here is that of the Congregationalists. However, it is reported that they are doing worse business than, for example, the Methodists, Anabaptists and Albrechtsleute. In the "Home Missionary" of June of last year, a Congregationalist magazine, an agent of this community writes (according to a translation in the "Evangelist"): "Our

Experience to date has led us to the conclusion that the establishment of German Longregationalist congregations in this state (Minnesota) is not encouraging. Even though the German Congregationalist preachers warmly sympathize with our principles and, with regard to baptism, only baptize children of believing (!) parents and only accept such members (!) into the congregation who have been renewed by the Holy Spirit, which, however, according to their practice, is not the case. And although the preachers are in the main right with regard to these teachings, it is almost impossible for them to teach the Germans this view and to oppose their stubborn demands. The Germans want to induce the preachers to modify their standpoint and to introduce state-church rules. Hours of prayer, revivals and conversions are not natural (!) to them. The preachers cannot live among them unless the Missionary Society takes over the almost exclusive support as "permanent commission". But since the Society cannot do this, the missionary is starved or discouraged. We have at present no German Longregationalist missionary in the State." - (So far the Missionary - Agent.) The Editor of the "*Home Missionary,"* after the "Evangelist," adds to this report the following words: "The report of our mission among the Germans may be applied with little modification to all the German missions which our Missionary Society has supported since the last forty terms. Only a few of them remain on an evangelical (!) standpoint, and not a single one has become independent. How can the millions of Germans be brought under the influence of truth? Who knows?" - If the sects only sought out the Germans where they were without church and school, who could blame them for that? But, alas, they prefer to intrude precisely where a righteous Lutheran preacher has already sown and planted with great "toil" and self-denial, in order to keep their harvest there from other people's labor. But this is nothing but an ungodly proselytizing. W.

Kansas Synod. Of this new General Synodical Synod and its first synodical meeting, the "*Observer*" of November 20 reports as follows: "According to an invitation published in the "*Observer*,' the following pastors and delegates assembled in the city of Topeka, Kansas, November 5, 1868: The Revs. Jno. G. Ellinger, J. E. McAfee, S. P. Harrington, M. G. Boyer, A. J. Heston, E. J. Keplinger, A. W. Wagenhals; delegates, G. M. Crotzer, etc. Rev. Harrington preached an appropriate sermon on Matt. 28:19. Introductory steps were then taken to organize the synod. The Business Committee submitted the following resolution: Since the time has come when the needs of the Lutheran Church in the States of Kansas and Missouri require that there be a vigorous organization in the same, looking more successfully to the various interests of our Western Zion, and promoting the same, be it resolved that this congregation proceed to organize a synod, and that a committee of 5-three pastors and two delegates be appointed to draft a constitution and submit a report as soon as possible. At the second meeting the following resolution was then presented and adopted: Resolved, That the congregation declare their doctrinal position to be that of the General Synod, accepting and holding with the Lutheran Church of our Fathers the Word of God, as contained in the canonical writings of Old and New Testament, as the only infallible guide of faith and life, and the Augsb. Confession as a correct exposition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded on that Word, and that it desired the framing of a Constitution. Whereupon the Committee reported, "The Committee on the framing of a Constitution, recognizing the great difficulty of their task, and desiring that all should be done with deliberation, and that it is impossible to frame a Constitution in so short a time, propose the Constitution of the Eastern Pennsylvania Synod, only that Kansas be substituted for Eastern Pennsylvania, and that a Committee of 3 be appointed to frame a new Constitution and submit it to the next Synodical Convention. The following officers were elected: President Past. S. P. Harrington, secretary E. J. Keplinger, treasurer A. W. Wagenhals. C.

II. Abroad.

The papal cry of repentance to the non-Catholics is scornfully discussed especially by the English press. But also the Greek journals express themselves very displeased about the papal imposition and declare it an insult to the Oriental Church. The Patriarch of the Greek Church has not accepted the letter to the Oriental bishops, which the Vicar of the Armenian Catholic Patriarch was commissioned to hand over, and it has been remarked by him that an approving answer is not to be expected at all.

(Ref.-Kirch.-Ztg.)

Wackernagel, the famous hymnologist, was made Doctor of Theology by the Faculty of Protestant Theology in Breslau. On the basis of this he writes in the preface to the second volume of his "Deutsches Kirchenlied", "Now I am ordered not to watch any harm to the church without contradiction." The excellent man, then, as far as his faith goes, seems to take this dignity more seriously than most of those raised to the same level with him. W.

Free Church. At the Cammin Conference, the Lutherans present within the Prussian Landeskirche (State Church) proposed, as the result of the present struggles, "A large, free Protestant national church in the sense of the Protestant Veretne, and alongside it the Lutheran church as a free church detached from the state; or the preservation and better organization of the Lutheran national and popular church, which in Germany could not bear any other physiognomy than Lutheran .

Receipt of the Papal Letter of Invitation by the Greek Pa triarch. - It was reported earlier that the Roman Pontiff had also sent a letter of invitation to the Greek Catholic Church to the great church assembly in Rome. In the "Leipzig" Lutheran Church Newspaper we have the following news about how the letter of invitation was handed over to the Greek Patriarch in Constantinople and how the Patriarch received the Pope's invitation. - Dom Testa, the deputy of the Roman Bishop Bruoni, had received the order to hand over to the Patriarch, who, like the Pope, bears the title of "His Holiness", the letter of invitation of the Pope Pius IX, which was provided with a precious binding. The audience had been fixed for October 3/15, and Dom Testa, accompanied by three other Abbe's, was received that day at the Patriarch's house with the usual solemnities. They were led to the Patriarch, where they were first admitted to kiss hands, and then, after he had embraced them in turn, they were invited to take their seats, all in a dignified and cordial manner. - The patriarch expressed his pleasure at the visit. Then the four envoys rose again, Dom Testa took out the letter from the pope, and one of the gentlemen addressed the patriarch in Greek as follows, "In the absence of Mr. Bruoni, we invite Your Holiness to the general conciliar to be held at Rome on the 8th of Dec. next, and beg that Your Holiness may receive from us the present letter of invitation." The patriarch gave Dom Testa a sign to lay the papal letter beside him, and returning the invitation, he first expressed his displeasure that the "papal letter" had been published in the newspapers. Since its contents were therefore known, and he knew in advance that it was in complete contradiction with the views of the orthodox Greek Church, he believed he could accept neither the invitation nor the letter. - He recalled that Pope Pius IX had already taken a similar step in 1848, and that the Greek Church had responded to it in an encyclical, in which the contradictions between the Greek and Roman Churches were clearly stated. A thousand years ago there was a Church that professed the same dogmas (beliefs) in the Orient as well as in the Occident, in the ancient as well as in the modern world.

in the new Rome. Let us go back to that time and see who added and who took away. Let us suppress the innovations, if there are any, and we shall then find ourselves quite unnoticed on the former common standpoint of Catholic orthodoxy, from which Rome, from the beginning of the separation (namely, between the Greek and Roman Churches), has more and more distanced itself, delighting in continually widening the abyss that separates us from one another by new dogmas and decrees (papal laws) deviating from sacred tradition." - The Patriarch added that, apart from Jesus Christ, he could not recognize a supreme bishop (and the Roman Pontiff wants to be such a bishop), an infallible patriarch, who claimed to be above the only infallible conciliar authorities. These Councils, however, would have to be convened in a different manner than had been the case with the Council that had been sent to Rome. If His. Holiness the Pope of Rome had acknowledged the apostolic equality and fraternity (thus ceasing to assert that he stands above the Greek patriarchs), instead of taking refuge in the newspapers and speaking in them as head, he would have sent a special letter to each of the patriarchs (namely, of the Greek Church, which has four patriarchs) and to the synods of the Greek Church, to inquire of his brethren whether they shared his view of the appointment of a council, what matters might be considered at it, and when the council should meet. - The patriarch concluded his answer with the following words: "Go back to history and to the ecumenical councils, if you want the true unity which we all long for to be achieved, or, if this is too difficult for you, let us be content to implore from God the unity of the Churches. - Hereupon he ordered fine Grand Vicar to hand the papal letter back to Bishop Bruoni's deputy. The Abbes rose and were escorted by the grand vicar to the stairs, whereupon they left the patriarch's palace. -

(Wisconsin Community Journal.)

"Der Freimund," in its number of Nov. 19 last, indicates that Kahnis' Dogmatics is now completed (1861 - 1868), and in so doing makes the remark: "Kahnis, as is well known, demands for himself a freer position on the doctrinal tradition, a position which will make possible the further development of doctrine in harmony with the results of Scriptural research. His demand is just, though his own attempts at a new presentation of doctrine do not all hold up." -So far, then, we have at last come that even those who lay claim to the name of decided Lutherans want to have the chosen "freer position" on the doctrine of their church preserved even for those who desire it for the sake of being able to teach and spread Arian and Zwinglian heresies within the orthodox church, because only thus "the further development of doctrine in harmony," not with Scripture, but "with the results of Scriptural research is made possible." W.

The spirit of New Protestantism is also stirring in Sweden, in the midst of the Lutheran National Synod recently held again for the first time in a long time. The main event of this synod was the proposal of Victor Rydberg, the author of the book "The Biblical Doctrine of Christ": to subordinate the authority of the symbolic books to that of the Bible in the spiritual oath of office. The majority of the Old Believers rejected the proposal; but just because of this a movement has arisen which will not rest until the goal is reached. Rydberg has hereby become the acknowledged leader of the ecclesiastical liberal party, and even the old University of Upsala has trodden on his sect. (Ref. Kirchenztg.)

The Catholic clergy in Kronstadt in Transylvania have included among the proposals for improvements in the Catholic Church called for by Bishop Fogaraffy the proposal for the abolition of celibacy. The document, which contains many other liberal demands, has been sent to Karlsburg, the seat of the aforementioned bishop. (Ref. Kirchenztg.)

In Baden the Diocesan Synod of Heidelberg-Mannheim voted with all against three, and a citizens' assembly in Mannheim voted unanimously for the conversion of the confessional schools into mixed schools. In Constance, which is always one step ahead on the progressive path, a mixed school was already opened at the beginning of November. (Ref. Kirchenztg.)

In the German-Russian Baltic provinces a Lutheran Catechism in Russian is issued by official authority. As the Roman Catholic Church is being made Russian, so the same is to be done with the Lutheran Church: the German language is no longer to be used in the service. (Ref. K.-Z.)

Heidelberg. A Heidelberg correspondent of the "Badische Landeszeitung" writes: "Why our university is so poorly attended by theologians remains a mystery to us. While in Halle (on October 31st of this year) 300 theologians are said to be enrolled, in Heidelberg their number barely exceeds 45. This decline is all the more striking, since the most capable (!) and recognized (!) scholars such as Hitzig. Schenkel, etc., are active here and considerably exceed the forces of other theological faculties in the whole." This is no mystery to the "Warte," indeed, it says: "Go on, gentlemen, in rejecting the branch on which you are sitting! Perhaps, once it is completely separated from the tree, it will no longer be a mystery to you why it has fallen.

The Jews in England. "Freimund" reports: "In the recently published essays by B. Cacroft (London, Trübner & Co.) there is a treatise on the Jews in Western Europe, which concludes with an overview of the conditions of this religious community in England and contains many interesting historical reminiscences. We report on this in connection with the English correspondence: In 1290, after a vain attempt by Edward I. to convert them to Christianity, they were driven out of the country in the harshest and cruelest manner, and only under Cromwell, in spite of fierce opposition by gifted men of the church and the law, were they again permitted to reside in England, without, however, being allowed a permanent settlement in the form of law. What the republican protector refused, the reactionary kings Charles II. and James II. approved: they granted naturalization patents to the Jews, and no matter how much effort was made to induce them to withdraw this privilege, they refused to break the given word. William IV, however, imposed on them a tax on foreigners, which was not repealed until the reign of George II, and at the same time an act was passed granting naturalization to foreign Jews. At that time the bishops and the most important statesmen were already in favor of this measure of toleration, but the mob was against it. To the cries of NoPopery was added the cry: 'No Jews, no clogs,' drowning out the voice of right. Sydenham, who had voted for the Jews, lost his seat for Exeter; the Bishop of Norwich, as often as he appeared in public, was insulted for his favourable vote. The street boys shouted to him to come and circumcise them; on the church towers were read, "On Sundays the Jews are confirmed, and on Sundays the Christians," and in the next session the Duke of Newcastle was compelled to invade a Bill nullifying the law just given, and to drive it with all speed through both Houses. - Again a century passed without any change in the position of the Jews, and so much did they cling to the old prejudice that a certain Saul, the son of a Jew and a Christian, though himself a Christian, could only obtain the citizenship of the City after repeated efforts continued for several years. It was not until the year 1830 that energetic steps were again taken for the civil and political emancipation of the Jews. Sir Francis Goldsmid was in the forefront of this effort, and Macauley earned his spurs in the relevant parliamentary negotiations. Again, twenty years later, when it was a question of admitting the Jews to Parliament, he made one of his most brilliant speeches, this time his maiden speech, but Sir R. Inglis, the Tory, prevailed, and the Bill proposing the Emancipation of the Jews fell by a considerable majority of votes.

By. More fortunate were the Jews outside the halls of legislation, and Lord Demnan, then Common-Sergeant of the City, permitted them to take the oath to the Old Testament and to become citizens of the City, thus opening the way to municipal offices. Thus in 1835 David Solomon became Sheriff of London and Middlessex, but with this was given a peculiar Conflict in his own person. For the sheriff of Middlessex, as a crown official, need not sign the declaration which concludes with the words 'in the true faith of a Christian' until after he had taken office, and could therefore instruct trials, cite jurors and fulfil the other obligations of a sheriff without hindrance. As Sheriff of London, however, he was an official of a corporation, and as such had to sign the conscious declaration before taking office and was therefore, as a Jew, unable to assume the post. A parliamentary act, which provided that the sheriff was not bound by any oath or affirmation to which the sheriff of a county was not bound, got him out of a tight spot, and at the end of the year he received an indemnity. Through this loophole the sheriff of Middlessex drew the Jewish sheriff of London through the ramparts of the law unscathed. Then followed several Jewish elections to municipal office, but all were annulled until Sir Robert Perl put an end to the scandal by an Act which removed the final formula which had been the stumbling block. Thus the civil emancipation of the Jews was decided, and only now began the struggle for their admission to Parliament, which lasted a full ten years, until in 1858 Disraeli happily removed it by a compromise which allowed Parliament to pull away the bar of the final formula at will. - Although the Jews are now completely equal to the other confessions in England, their number in the united kingdom is said to be hardly more than 40,000, of which about 25,000 are in London. Most of them have immigrated from Germany and Poland. New immigrants arrive every year, but others leave for the colonies. In 1859 there were 41 synagogues, since then many new ones have been built, among them in Birmingham, Edinburg. Glasgow, have been added. Most of them follow the German rite, but those who adhere to the Spanish and Portuguese rite consider themselves of purer blood and do not like to marry other Jewish communities. For twenty years, by the way, a Reform party has been formed here also, which began by preaching in pure English instead of in Jewish-German gibberish, but later went further and, as no German rabbi would place himself at its head, entrusted himself to the leadership of an Englishman, Dr. Marks. The non-observance of a Biblically "not commanded" second Easter, Pentecost, and Tabernacles holiday was the first stone of contention. The Reformers denied the obligatory nature of the same, and were heretized for it by the non-Reformers. The Reformers separated, adopted their own prayer book and built their own synagogue. The deputation of the Congregation of British Jews' (this was the name given to the old Jewish representative body in England) with Sir Moses Montefiore at its head, however, refused to register this synagogue, by which alone the marriages concluded in it could attain validity. Again, a parliamentary act helped out, which only requires the testimony of the secretary of a congregation for registration, and only through this were the reformers able to formally constitute themselves. They place themselves on biblical ground, maintain only a few of the traditional customs, and expand their congregation with each passing year."

Saxony. The Muldenthal, Upper and Lower Erzgebirge and Hohenstein-Oberlungewitz Pastoral Conferences agreed on July 5. The Lutheran Church sees itself, if the Union seeks to break into its borders, as being *in statu confessionis* and compelled to withdraw from the pastorally granted hospitality (at the table of the Lord) and to preserve its ecclesiastical position by refusing communion. The Conference therefore most decidedly protests against any indiscriminate communion of the Lord's Supper, as has recently taken place in Saxony at Prussian military services."

---------- ----------

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume XV. February 1869. No. 2.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 29.

Also after confirmation the preacher has to take care of the youth in his congregation, to take care of this group of especially endangered sheep of Christ seriously and to keep a watchful eye on them, therefore to arrange regular church examinations and to do everything he can, to see to it that the confirmed youth attends the same willingly, to see to it that they regularly attend the church services, diligently use confession and the Lord's Supper and regularly register for these in person, to avoid seductive company and dangerous gatherings, whether in public places (in drinking houses and the like) or secretly (especially in the church).), or secretly (especially in this case of both sexes), also dishonorable or even lewd games (Prov. 7, 13.) and the attendance of the theater, public balls, circuses and the like. (Prov. 7:13), avoid the theater, public balls, circuses, etc., do not join ungodly societies (gymnastic societies, etc.) or societies that are dangerous to their inexperience and immaturity, do not fall for soul-poisoning literature (ungodly newspapers, salacious or overstated novels and novellas, naturalistic writings, etc.), and so on.

Note 1.

In the Constitution of the Synod of Missouri, etc., it says of this point: "The Synod of Districts makes it the duty of conscience of its preachers not to lose sight of the catechumens after their confirmation, to take special fatherly care of them, and therefore, among other things, to hold public Sunday examinations of the catechism with them wherever possible."

Note 2.

The more inclined young people are to withdraw from the supervision of their pastor after confirmation, and the easier it is for them to do so, especially here, the more necessary it is for the pastor to seek to know how his confirmands are doing and to follow them. The pastor must be careful not to intervene only when the youth or virgin, unobserved as they were, has already escaped from the church and become a prey of the world. In particular, the preacher should diligently check whether the confirmed person regularly attends the services and church examinations and diligently comes to confession and Holy Communion. The preacher should faithfully use the registrations to find out how the confirmed person is doing outwardly and inwardly, and to get to know their heart and conscience. If, of course, it is ever necessary for the preacher to guard against legalistic morality and to practice pastoral care in a truly evangelical spirit and manner, it is especially necessary in the treatment of the youth. Col. 3, 21, 1 Cor. 4, 15, 1 Thess. 2, 7. Monkish darkness and legalistic compulsion is here completely evil. We remember here what Luther says about Eccl. 12, 1. He writes: "Solomon is a right royal schoolmaster. He does not forbid the youth to be with the people or to be cheerful, as the monks do to their pupils; for they become vain wood and blocks, as the mother of all monks, Anselmus, has said: A young man, thus harnessed and drawn away from people, is like planting a fine young tree, which might bear fruit, in a narrow pot. For in this way the monks have caught their youth, as one puts birds in the peasantry, so that they must neither see nor hear the people, and must not speak to anyone. But it is dangerous for young people to be alone like this, to be separated from people. Therefore young people should be allowed to hear and see and experience all kinds of things, but they should be kept in discipline and honor. Such monastic constraints are not appropriate. It is good that a young man should be much with the people, but that he should be honestly brought to honesty and virtue, and kept from vices. Such tyrannical, monkish compulsion is quite harmful to young people, and they need joy and pleasure as much as they need food and drink. For the sooner they remain in health. So a man should be especially diligent to fear and know God, to hear and learn the word of God, and to be of an honorable mind; if he fears God and is devout in heart, his body will soon be trained accordingly. Therefore care must be taken that he is not brought up in a monkish way, and that he is not too melancholy, which is his nature and manner; only that good care is taken that he does not fall into a wild way of being. For indulging, playing, courting are not the joy of the heart, of which he speaks here, but often bring sadness." (V, 2348. f.)

If the Christian-minded young people in the congregation form associations, the preacher should gain access to their meetings and try to make them not only harmless but also useful and at the same time interesting, entertaining and pleasant. Although the preacher must take care that the association does not become a center of pleasure, he must not demand of the young people the seriousness of the old, nor deprive the association of the innocent pleasure of free self-government.

An important part of the preacher's care for the youth is to see to it that the meetings of both sexes never take place otherwise than under the supervision of Christian-minded parents or, at least, of those who are seriously married in their Christianity.

Note 3.

Concerning the church examinations, some remarks of old faithful teachers may find place here.

Johann Fecht writes: "Although the preaching of the divine word is rightly regarded as the most important duty of a church minister, for the sake of the divinity of the word itself, which he delivers, there is no doubt that catechetical instruction, which is no less a part of the delivery of the divine word, promises even more fruit and benefit, because it comes closer to the listener and, through constant questioning, awakens him to attention, which is usually lacking in the sermons. For this reason, the church minister should consider this instruction to be the most important and most excellent part of his office. His own conscience must awaken him to undertake this work with all seriousness*) and to implant Christianity in the young hearts. Since, if it is lacking here, the lack thereafter extends to all the rest of life." (*Instruct, pastoral, c.* 11, § I. p. 101.)

Deyling writes: "A wise church servant will only deal with what is necessary, especially useful, and appropriate to the comprehension of those who are still weak in knowledge. But what is considered necessary is that which belongs to the foundation of faith and to a godly life. He will arrange his discourses in such a way that he need not be answered at length, but that the question may be answered by the catechumen in a few words, or by a yes or a no. It will be useful to ask the same question. It will be of use to repeat the same question with changed words, not once, but often, together with the answer and its improvement, and with more extensive confirmation, that the whole assembly present in the church may

*It cannot be emphasized enough how necessary it is to take the public church examinations seriously. The mere holding of these examinations, however regular, is not enough; indeed, if the examinations are dry and the catechist moves only in well-known generalities, this is the surest means of arousing contempt, even disgust, in the youth for the activity of the Word of God. If ever, everything here must be lively, practical, and captivating to the attention.

...I'm gonna get something out of this. *) Therefore, in the catechisms, consideration is not to be given to memory as well as to understanding. It is of little use to keep in one's memory what one does not really understand. Therefore the Bible verses to be learned by heart should first be diligently explained, so that they may be rightly understood by the boys and the whole congregation. The minister must also endeavor that no one who is somewhat timid and ignorant be deterred from the examination by too sharp a rebuke, but that all, even the more grown-up ones, be rather enticed by kind words and by being shown the exceedingly great benefit of the catechisms, at least as an audience, to attend the examinations, at least as listeners, and to have the catechism in their hands, which is to be interpreted by the pastor and always applied after each main lesson for the improvement of the heart, for zeal in true godliness, and for the comfort to be derived from it." (Institut. prud. pastoral. III, 2, 9. p. 311.)

Finally, we cannot refrain from sharing a longer section from the catechetics of Christoph Timotheus Seidel, in which he gives especially important hints concerning the church examinations to be conducted with the youth, which are not found in other catechetics. Seidel writes: "Just as catechization is a work in which everything depends on the catechist, so it is easy to think that the fruit of it cannot be obtained if the catechist prevents it by his own mistakes. A conscientious catechist, therefore, must not only know his own person most accurately, and examine whether he is aware of any such faults in himself; he must also take care of himself in the performance of the whole work, lest he be most guilty of the blindness and wickedness of those who are entrusted to his instruction, and thereby multiply his responsibility. He who wishes to satisfy his conscience in this matter will consider the following: 1) Whether he has prepared himself sufficiently in every catechism, and has grasped the truths of which he wishes to inquire with his own mind with due clearness, thoroughness, and order? 2) Whether he comes to the catechizing with such a mind as possesses a true love for the souls entrusted to him, and consequently finds pleasure and delight in the work; or whether, on the contrary, it is a forced being, which he makes a burden of himself, and performs with unwillingness and displeasure? 3) Whether he perceives anything in his language and idioms which may be offensive to the catechumens? 4) Whether he has accustomed himself to a position of the body, or to such a movement of the limbs, as may be objectionable to people?

*This is an extremely important rule. The examinations with the youth must be arranged in such a way that the whole congregation is encouraged and their participation is awakened in every way. This also has an effect on the youth. Vulgarity is not popular, and the consideration of simplicity does not exclude thoroughness.

of less frame of mind can give cause to show him the respect due to him and, except in this case, without being refused? 5) Whether he will notice anything unusual in his dress, or that will cause distraction, laughter, and consequent annoyance? And from these considerations we shall deduce the following duties of a catechist towards himself. The first duty of the catechist towards himself is: A conscientious catechist must always form in his mind a clear idea of the truths of which he wishes to inquire. He must memorize the order in which he wishes to inquire, that he may be able to hold his thoughts together according to the same, as by a proper guide, and not make digressions from one thing to another, by which he may confuse the catechumens, and finally himself also, and be obliged to break off and make an end before the time, with consternation and a desire to get away from such a vexatious labor. We reckon it among the duties of a teacher that he should prepare himself with all deliberation for every catechism. This will perhaps seem to many to be something superfluous, and the duties of the catechist too highly exalted. I know a teacher at a high school who was visited by a country preacher. The country preacher knew that there was only half an hour left for the former to read. He took leave of him with the excuse that he would have to prepare himself for the work ahead. But the latter answered: "Does the pastor prepare himself when he wants to catechize? It is unfortunate students who fall into the hands of people of this kind. It amounts to a disorderly washing , and they sin grievously against God. Every catechization must be based on M
previous one. It is necessary to consider what was defective in the first one, and what is to be replaced in the next.

He must vividly imagine the different states of his catechumens, and prepare for each one that by which his true best may be promoted. In the latter he must use strong reasons of proof, as in the former he has only prepared the mind for more important things by means of a few images. And so it will not require much testimony that the catechist is bound to send himself beforehand to every catechism. 1) He who has not yet had sufficient practice and skill in catechizing will do well if, at every catechism, he draws up a large number of questions, and considers beforehand what kind of answer the catechumens might give him, and how, in such a case, he will meet them in one way or another. To be sure, one never binds himself to such questions. This would be torture, and contrary to all the rules of catechism which we have given in the first chapter. But in the beginning it is necessary. The questions fall

...is not always immediately available. One must have collected a supply for this purpose. Practice will of itself give opportunity to increase and multiply such a stock into many baptizing ones. 2) But even when one has acquired more skill and practice, he must still meditate beforehand on any catechizing. The doctrines of faith and life which are to be taught must be gone over. The examples, the parables, the sayings of Scripture, which are to be adduced in proof, must be considered with some care. They must be held up to the condition of their catechumens, whether they are capable of having their minds helped by them; whether it is necessary to have others help them, or whether these are sufficient; whether they have been used before, and therefore whether it is necessary to choose others. We put it to teachers, who at such times, when they have this work before them, can be found in extensive societies, and take up the mantle with great chagrin, when the sexton has reminded them some times that the bell has rung: we put it to them themselves whether they can regard catechization as a work which deserves so little preparation. We also know well that some honest men, who are sometimes entrusted with three or more congregations, and who have to preach two or more times every Sunday, often lack the time for such preparation, as well as the strength of body and mind, which has been weakened by the preceding sour labors. The latter, however, will nevertheless, in the preceding days, take so much thought of their intended work and the condition of their catechumens, that their enfeebling effort will not be without blessing by the grace of God. But he who has been accustomed to do catechism as a work which can be begun and completed without thought, let him note well what has been said to him in these recollections. 8) The best preparation is to place oneself in the place of one's catechumens and to judge from the work one has done on them up to now what is further necessary for each one and in what way each one must be met. Such a preparation, which is arranged according to the condition of the different catechumens, must necessarily bring forth an indescribable quantity of thoughts, which serve for the improvement of Christ's army. And how blessed is such an effort! It requires much effort. But he who has a conscience will not shrink from such labor.- The other duty of the catechist toward himself is: that he encourage himself in every possible way to do this work with pleasure and delight. For if he undertakes such work with displeasure and reluctance, he will lack the cheerfulness indispensable to this work, and no more distressing work than this will be found. In catechism it is soon seen whether it is done with pleasure. The gestures of the teacher and the faces of the students both reveal it.

...and compete with each other. The teacher must therefore encourage himself to do this. He will be able to avail himself of our counsel, which consists in the following: 1) First of all, one must call upon God both for his help and for the desire to do a work which seems so contemptible before the world and before flesh and blood, and for which a true denial of oneself is required if one intends to accomplish something fruitful. 2) Consider the command of Christ our Arch Shepherd, who expressly commanded to feed his lambs. He who knows in his spirit what an evangelical teacher is, will never be displeased. 3) By a sensible method of catechizing, one must know how to bring about the love and affection of his catechumens. A loving contact with them gives an immense desire to work. The hours spent in talking with them are often longer than the time spent in seeing one's own child. This love also relieves what is sour about it." (Instruction based on experience, which is the true method of catechizing. Other edition. Helmstädt, 1748. p. 124. ff.)

(To be continued.)

Is the Antichrist to be found in the atheism of our time?

Many think that if Luther had had an inkling that such an apostasy would lead to complete unbelief and atheism, as it does in our day, he would certainly not have declared the pope to be the Antichrist, but unbelief and a person who placed himself at the head of the unbelievers. This opinion, however, is a serious error. Luther not only knew that in God's Word, apart from, after, and besides the Antichrist and his apostasy, gross unbelief and his apostasy were also prophesied; he also clearly foresaw in the light of prophecy the coming of gross unbelief, and yet was none the less firmly convinced that the Antichrist, who was to sit in the temple of God (2 Thess. 2.), and the scoffers, who would leave the church and mock all her secrets of faith (2 Petr. 3, 3. ff.), would be two different manifestations in the last days of the world. About this we let follow some curious explanations of Luther:

"Now that they have been freed from papal coercion and its manifold deceitfulness, they think they are also completely free and free from all God's obedience and service; they would also like to be free from all worldly rights and order, and the devil has them full, both spiritual and worldly rebellion, against God and man. And those who seek, indeed need, such freedom from the pope most of all, as bishops, princes, canons, nobles, who want to keep other people under the pope by great force; for they do not give a straw for all papal teaching; they

want alone to have such freedom. And in spite of the pope, that he now forbid or ban the bishops and princes, as he did before, they should become seven times Lutheran against him, and force him a little more than Luther did. Which they shall do at last, as Rev. John 17:16 prophesies. Other people, that is, the Lutherans, who have earned such freedom at great cost, shall remain under the Pope's compulsion and publicly recognized lies, or die and be driven out. That is, we are to be the industrious bees who make the honey, but they, the lazy bumblebees, want to eat the honey.

"I say this to anyone who will accept it as a warning, because everything and everyone almost wants to be free and despises God's word. For there is an old prophecy among the images of the Antichrist, which says, that at the end of the world, when the deceitfulness of the Antichrist shall be discovered, men shall become fierce and brutal, and shall fall from all faith, saying that there is no more God, and so shall live in all folly, after their own lusts. 2 Thess. 2, 3. Such pictures move me very much, and are especially true. For to have no God is to believe neither this nor that, but to be free from all teaching and preaching that is done under God's name. For God cannot be had except by the word and faith alone. As St. Paul saith in Eph. 2:12, that the Gentiles were without God before, when the world was full of gods: but they had no word after faith from God. And also 2 Thess. 2, 4. saith, that the Antichrist shall rise, not above God (for that is impossible), but *supra dic'um et cultum Deum,* that is, above God's word *and* service.

"Such epicuri and God-rejecters are now publicly tearing into Germany, as it was torn into Welschland before, and (unfortunately) wants to become a Welsch regiment both in secular and spiritual status. This has been brought in by the Curtisans and national servants, as they have seen and learned in Rome and in the Welsh country: with the Welsh regiment will also come the Welsh plagues and misfortunes; so it is over with Germany and will be called *fuit.*

"Once a fine man (and why should I not name him), He Asch of Cram Blessed, spoke to me and asked: whether men of war (where they would otherwise be believers) could also take pay with a good conscience? To which I also answered in writing. Among others, there were speeches (I do not know how) about the great usury, which is called "interest": and before that time, both word and deed were quite unknown. How, said I, have not men then a conscience that feared the judgment of God and hell? Yea, said he, they thus speak, Thinkest thou that there is yet a fellow in this fellow?" (i.e. God be a

*) Yes, Napoleon I and Victor Emmanuel have indeed "dared" him and the Chambers of Austria and Spain do not understand the "dare" badly either.

mere scarecrow). "Such a word stung my heart, because I had neither suspected nor worried about such impudent, free speech in the German country. But God grant you be few among the nobility, and not many among the peasants. For such fellows will soon help the dear Gospel down, and bring the last darkness with haste, of which Christ says Luc. 18:8: "Thinkest thou, when the Son of man cometh, that he shall find faith? And both he and St. Paul say that the last day will come at night, when it is darkest!

"And to this end the dear nobles, bishops, cardinals, and canons, who are free of temperance and proud, help with all their might and full speed; they leave, yes, make many parishes empty and desolate, so that the rabble may quickly become raw, wild, and pagan, and neither hear nor learn anything about God and the salvation of souls; so that one can see how completely pious Epicurians they themselves are, and want to make all the world like them, also Epicurian. Well, it is their office, they should do so; they are not worthy of anything better. God's anger drives them to help the cause to the end, yet they pretend that they do not want to suffer Lutherans; just as if they were serious about holding and teaching their own ugly doctrine, which would be ten times more unpleasant for them than Luther's. Sed mitte vadere? sicut vadit; quia vult vadere, sicut vadit.

"Because such a terrible and wholly Papist, that is, Epicurean and Welsh nature is involved, let anyone who can help have mercy on the youth, on our dear offspring, and on all God's chosen children who are yet to come, and who have not yet all been born, and who must also come to baptism and to Christ through our service and help, to which we are also called, and live precisely for the sake of it: otherwise our faith would be enough for our person, no matter what hour we die. And woe to all woe, where we cast such service and calling to the winds! God will require it of us, and will take account of us of all the descendants of souls that have been neglected through us. Therefore I say again, let him be David who is able, and do according to his example what every man is able, especially princes and rulers, who have power and good enough from God: and he will restore much more, even a hundredfold, and in addition eternal life, as he so abundantly promises Matt. 19:29. 19, 29. And it cannot happen that so much more will happen, so that the schools and the preachers' chairs (which may not be so abundant) will remain, because there are so many monasteries, convents, and fiefs. The above prophecy will certainly be fulfilled. God grant that we may be found beforehand contrary to it and taught, together with all who are dear to us, to have departed in a good hour and to be done with Lot out of damned Sodom and Gomorrah, Amen!" (Interpretation of the 101st Ps. Walch. V. pp. 1243-47.)

"When after us the doctrine of the gospel shall fall, then shall come spirits, which shall preach such foolish things, of which we now would be ashamed, and would not hear, *) yet shall they worship and receive it for sanctuary, as in time past the great emperors, kings, doctors of the Scriptures, and wise men, have been thus made fools of, that the caps and plates of the monks, which they put on in distress of death, and were buried within, should from this hour forth have been made fools of. Scripture, and wise men have thus been fooled into believing that the caps and plates of monks, which they put on in distress of death, and let themselves be buried in, should lead them from this hour to heaven, and make them blessed, as is still believed in Hispania and France." (Homilies on the 3rd and 4th Cap. Joh. Erlanger Edition 47, 35.)

"I also have been so deep in darkness, that I was even an enemy to Christ, and loved Mariam and St. George. So the world is corrupting, and you will see, when we are dead, that you will have much more ghastly darkness, and that so many sects and cults and fluttering spirits will come and make you so mad that you will not know where to turn or where to stay." (Ibid. 41.)

"The devil is busy and attacks Christ with three heads. One will not let him be God. The other will not let Him be man. The third will not let Him do what He has done. Each of the three does not want to make Christ. For what is the use of confessing that he is God, if you do not also believe that he is man? For in this thou hast not the whole true Christ, but a specter of the devil. What profit is it if thou confessest that He is man, when thou believest not also that He is God? What is the use of confessing that He is God and man, if you do not also believe that He became and did all things for you? Just as it did not help those who confessed that He died for us, etc., and yet did not believe that He was God (like the Arians) or not man (like the Manichees). Truly all three parts must be believed, namely, that He is God; item, that He is man; item, that He became such a man for us, i. e., as the first Symbolum says, "Conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of Mary of virgins, suffered, was crucified, died, and rose again, etc."; and that He died for us. If one piece is missing, all pieces are missing. For faith should and must be whole and complete; though it may be weak and contested, yet it should and must be whole and not false. To be weak does no harm, but to be false is eternal death. -

"Now of the third company there shall come, and there are many ready, which shall not believe that Christ is risen from the dead, nor that he sitteth on the right hand of God, and whatsoever more of Christ

*) E.g. the ghost-knocking, the table-backing and so on.

If they follow in faith, they will break the bottom of the barrel and put an end to the game. For with this the whole Christ will perish; and if the world think not of the life to come, then Christ is no more. For he who does not hope for the life to come must not believe in Christ any more than the cows and other animals of paradise, because Christ's kingdom is not on earth, nor can it be, as He Himself confessed before Pilate, John 18:36, "My kingdom is not of the world. Such faith began at Rome in the pope's court, and the same leaven leaveneth all the ecclesiastical classes, from the cardinals to the altarists. They may say that Christ is God and man and that he suffered, and they also rebuke the old heretics (for it carries money, honor, and violence), but that they are not serious proves that they think nothing of the resurrection and eternal life. They are called epicureans among the heathen; the poets think they are swine, and call them swine also. Such saints also Christ found among His people when He came on earth, and are called in the Gospel *Σαδδουχαῖοι*, or Sadducaei; how much more shall He find the world full of them when He shall come from heaven, and shall not be bad tame sows, but quite wild sows, who shall not only despise God, but shall have neither reason nor human timidity. For He will come at midnight, when it is darkest of all, and the people are most angry, as is fitting to be at the end of the world, as He came in the flood, in Egypt, over Babylon," etc. (Walch X, 1208. 10.)

Luther therefore knows very well that in the last days "scoffers" will come, and describes them as "wild sows, who not only despise God, but will also have neither reason nor human shyness," but he does not teach that the Antichrist is such a wild sow, in a filthy stable, where all shyness and shame is cast off; but, enlightened by the Word of God, he sees the true right Antichrist in the holy father at Rome, surrounded by his holy cardinals and reverend concilia. For Antichrist sits like a god in the temple, and not like a sow in the sty. But both beasts are against Christ, and the coming of both at the end of the world is revealed in Scripture.

Furthermore, Luther writes in his interpretation of a passage from the prophet Jeremiah (Walch VI, 1395): "Therefore, let us keep this text (Jerem. 23:6) in mind, so that when the sects and heretics stand up and challenge this article of our faith, that Christ is not a true and natural God (as this heresy will certainly come), we will be prepared to hold this saying up to their noses, against which they can easily raise no objections. Ah yes, this heresy has come!

Not only the crude materialists, the speculative Hegelians, the loquacious Protestant Unificationists, but even "Lutheran" professors in Lutheran universities lie that "Christ is not a true and natural God."

In the interpretation of Daniel 12, 6-12. it says (Walch VI, 1485 -1489): "The man in linen clothes is the angel (Gabriel) who has spoken until now. But he that saith unto him, If it be so, etc., is not named. But there is a voice and a lamentation in the person of the church, saying, Help God. Is it not enough that the end of Christ has so horribly and almost destroyed the church? Now that it has scarcely been restored by Michael, the heretics, the red spirits, the Sacramentans, and the Anabaptists are coming, and they are also committing abominations: when will it cease? Besides, avarice and mammon are so entrenched that it is to be feared the gospel will be starved out and respected, as Loth was respected in Sodom, and Noah before the flood; for now in the world both the ruler and the ruled want to hear and see nothing but avarice, usury, and their own will. That the time has come, of which Lyra and others all say, that after the end of Christ's fall the world will live freely and say, **"There is no longer any God."....** Now when this time, two times and half a time, shall be over, and when the heretics shall cease from scattering and dividing the church, we cannot know either, until the church, a poor multitude of one, shall remain united in the word, and the heretics with the world shall all become full, weary, and epicurious, that no man shall any more take hold of the Scriptures. It seems as if they do not value the Scriptures and God's word, so that they should become heretics or Christians in them. So it is ended, as Christ says, Luke 18:8: "When the Son of Man comes, do you think He will find faith on earth? So small must the church become, and everything become vain avarice, usury, belly, food and flesh, as before the flood of sin. But I would gladly interpret the daily sacrifice in a spiritual way, that it is the holy gospel, which has been kept alive until the end of the world. Gospel, which must remain until the end of the world, together with the faith and the church. But yet it may come to pass that the world will even become epicurean, that there will be no public preaching place in all the world, and that public speaking will be a vile epicurean abomination, and that the gospel will be preserved only in the homes through the fathers of the household. And let this be the time between the words of Christ on the cross, Consummatum est; and in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum! For as Christ lived a little after such a consummatum, so also the church may live a little after the public silence of the gospel. And as the daily sacrifice of the Jews was fulfilled in the seventh week by the apostles.

Concilium, and yet afterwards remained until the destruction of Jerusalem, and was also kept by the apostles themselves, where they would, (yet without necessity): so also the gospel may lie publicly and be silent in the preaching seat, and yet be preserved by devout Christians in houses. But such affliction shall not last longer than 1290 days, that is, four and a half years; for without public preaching the faith cannot stand long, because at this time also in one year the world becomes more evil. The last 1335 days will be evil at last, so that even in houses there will be little faith. Therefore He says: Blessed is he who endures until that day. As if to say, as Christ says, Luke 18:8, "When the Son of Man comes, do you think he will find faith on earth? Almost all the teachers have spoken of these four and a half years, and all the books are full of them, but they have not pointed to the reign of the end of Christ. Which, according to the order of the text, Daniel suffereth not, who knoweth further what shall come to pass after the fall of the end of Christ, and setteth these four years and a half after Michael, and after the oath of the angel upon the face of the waters." -

Protest of the English District of the Synod of Ohio against a resolution of the same affecting the former.

Thus, in the Jan. 21 issue of the *Lutheran and Missionary,* the secretary of that district wrote: "Readers of the '*Lutheran Standard*' will have found the following in the proceedings of the General Synod published there, under No. 3 of the Presidential Report: With respect to the English District, I would observe that for several years it has carried on the business of well-known insults, and, in spite of more than sufficient exhortations, has persistently opposed the General Synod, declaring its independence, which is neither justified by our Constitution nor confirmed by us. By its separate, arbitrary union with the *General Council,* this District has entered upon a path which diverts it from the course prescribed by us, and accordingly persists in its factious position against us. Under the present circumstances, a union with the *General Council* and with us at the same time is simply impossible; we cannot, therefore, recognize the English District in its present position as belonging to us as long as it has not removed the given impulse. But we would like to exclude from this accusation those brethren of that District who have no part in that offence and therefore do not wish to separate from us, but would gladly recognise them as a regular District as soon as they give up that false position. In any case, however, in order to meet their needs, the English language should have equal rights at future Synodal meetings. Be it therefore resolved,

That the above be hereby acknowledged as our Declaration, and by virtue of the same we advise the faithful brethren of the English District to call an Extra Session and, if possible, to effect a satisfactory change in that position which vexes us, or, if this cannot be accomplished, to bring about an organization with which the Synod as a whole may be satisfied, unless a union of the individual members with other Districts should be preferred, This declaration has been published not only in the *Standard,* but also in the German proceedings of the General Synod. It raises serious charges against a body which, in points of disagreement with the General Synod, has acted entirely in accordance with the Constitution and in the fear of God. She alleges that the English District has for several years made a business of well-known offenses, of which I must humbly say against the body that made this declaration, that the same are unknown to me, because in reality they never happened. It charges the District with having declared its independence from the Synod as a whole, which it has not done, nor does it intend to do. It claims for the Synod as a whole the right to prescribe a course for the District with regard to the union of all true Lutherans, which it must observe, whether or not this is in accord with its sense of duty to God and the whole Church. It recommends dissolution of the Synod and publicly advises its members to separate and thus become schismatics, telling them also that they should be recognized if they would organize in opposition to the District. It was not our wish to bring our quarrels before the public; we would rather have borne injustice than enter into a quarrel with men with whom we still heartily desire to work together. Since, however, the *Standard* has published the above as an official act of the General Synod, we feel compelled to respond publicly to statements which we believe do great injustice to our Synod, and which, if not corrected, are likely to do serious harm. The President of our District Synod has therefore made a serious protest against that Act, and sent the same to the President of the General Synod, with a request that it should be published in the *Standard, in order* that statements which he has been compelled to consider unjust may be corrected by the same means by which they have come into the public domain. However, this request was not granted. Thus the President of our Synod felt compelled to send me the following copy of his protest with the request that, as he himself is prevented from doing so by illness, I should send it with the necessary explanation to the "*Lutheran and Missionary"*: Rev. M. Loy, President of the Lutheran Synod of Ohio and the surrounding States: As President of the English Lutheran District Synod, etc., I deem it my duty to hereby officially and in the name of said District

To lodge a solemn protest against the Act of the General Synod at its recent meeting at Birmingham, Pa. against our English District Synod. The declaration of said General Synod is indeed quite false, and the Act based thereon unconstitutional and void. Moreover, it is unchristian and unchurchlike, and as long as the English District Synod does not decide otherwise, it will not and shall not deprive the said District of any of its rights and privileges as an integral part of the General Synod. The attempt which the Synod as a whole is making to create and promote disorder and division within the boundaries of the English District is a further reason for this protest, and deserves to be detested and rejected not only by the members and congregations of the English District, but by all true Lutherans in general, which I hope will also be granted to it. Further, I hereby declare that the union of the English District Synod with the General Council is not meant to, nor does it amount to, hindering any constitutional purpose for the sake of which the various District Synods are united into one General Synod, and I deny the constitutional right of the latter, which it assumes by the act against which this protest is made, to prescribe a course in the matter of which the General Synod complains. Instead of the English Synod of Districts being guilty of insults against the Synod as a whole, a real insult has been done to the District by the Synod as a whole and is still being done to it in the attempt to arrogate to itself and exercise an unconstitutional power over and against its special rights and powers. Further, I hereby remind the General Synod that unless they take speedy steps to right the wrongs attempted against the English District, or if any steps are taken, whether by the General Synod itself or by officers authorized by it, they will not be able to do so, against the rights and privileges of some or all of the members of the District, the English District Synod still has the aid of the laws of the land, especially of the State of Ohio, which it will invoke, if it shall seem fit, whenever that shall be necessary. My own wish, and I believe the wish of every member of the English District, is that the peace, unity and brotherly love of former years may prevail among all parts of the Synod. But if I am not mistaken in the sentiment of the members of the English District, the great majority of them feel that we have silently tolerated until the duty became unavoidable, for the sake of our own peace and for the peace of the congregations associated with us, to resist the unjust and tyrannical presumptions of the ruling majority of the General Synod with all the means at our command. Let those who have caused the trouble also bear the responsibility for it, etc.

 over the known four points.

Dan. Worley, President of the English District.'" Now truly, any true Lutheran, indeed any simple-minded Christian, need only have read this protest to see at once that the 'Standard' certainly could not receive the same. So far, then, as the threat of the secular arm could the unfortunate man stoop in his blind zeal! These are never and never the weapons of our knighthood, and such an appeal only betrays the powerlessness to prove his right from God's word to be a good and divine one. How would this be possible in the present case? For if the Constitution of the Synod of Ohio were to contain nothing to the effect that a District Synod could not enter into ecclesiastical relations with other bodies for itself, without being contrary to the will of the Synod as a whole, to which it belongs and wishes to belong, this is so self-evident that, for example, Mr. Worley himself would laugh if he were to say that the Synod of Ohio is a Synod. Mr. Worley himself would laugh if a politician were to dream that the State of Ohio, for example, could enter into a state union with the French Empire, if the Constitution of the United States did not deny it the right to do so in explicit terms, for itself and while it claimed to want to be and remain an integral part of the United States. However, this trade teaches that it is good and wise if, as is done in the Constitution of our Synod, the power to enter into new ecclesiastical connections is expressly granted to the General Synod and denied to the District Synods. For as can be seen here, the General-Conciliar spirit, which can admit reformed persons as such to its Lutheran communion table, can also tolerate such monstrous things as the English District Synod of Ohio has practiced, and which Mr. Worley imagines to have justified with his empty assertions.

---------- ^-4^ ----------

Minority Report

on the known four points, submitted at the meeting of the Concil of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Although there is much that is true and correct in the submission of the Committee that has to report on the four points to the Assembly of the General Council, the undersigned were not in a position to sign it for reasons of conscience. They therefore take the liberty of submitting the following minority report to the Honorable Assembly.

I. Chiliasm.

1. With regard to chiliasm, we unreservedly confess what our Lutheran Church confesses in Art. 17 of the Augustana.

2. With our Lutheran Church, therefore, we reject every form of chiliasm, both the crude and the subtle, according to which a visible return of Christ before His coming at the Last Judgment is possible.

Judgment taught, a bodily resurrection of the dead assumed at the last day, and the kingdom of Christ's cross changed into a kingdom of glory and worldly rule with Christ here on earth before the last day.

II. Secret societies.

1. Since the secret societies: Freemasons, Oddfellows, etc. They strive for the happiness of men without Christ;

2. Their basic principles, on which they are built and according to which they are guided, are contrary to the Christian faith;

3. By humanistic benevolence many unfortified members of our church have been drawn into their circles, and have thereby done great mischief in the church; thus

4. From the standpoint of the Word of God and our Christian faith, we cannot do otherwise than call them antichristian societies, dangerous to the salvation of souls, and we see ourselves compelled to warn the members of our church seriously against them.

III. Pulpit Fellowship.

1. It is the sacred duty of Christian preachers and of all Christian congregations to see to it that in their pulpits the gospel of Christ is proclaimed in all its parts, pure and unadulterated.

2. Our innermost conviction is that, among all denominations, the Lutheran Church alone confesses and teaches in its confessional writings the pure and honest truth of the Word of God.

3. Faithfulness to this confession and serious responsibility for the souls entrusted to us therefore require that the custom of pulpit fellowship with those of other faiths, which is customary here, be rejected as an unwise practice dangerous to our Lutheran Church.

IV. Communion.

1. we believe and confess with the whole Lutheran Church that among all church communions on earth in the Lutheran Church alone the Holy Supper is rightly taught and administered according to the institution of Christ.

2. The fathers of our church, both in the old and in the new fatherland, took great care to ensure that comrades of two different confessions did not participate in the celebration of the same.

3. It is therefore our duty, on the basis of our confession and in harmony with our fathers, to reject communion with non-Lutherans.

Attentive

John Bading. R. Adelberg. S. Klingmann.

Dance and Church Discipline.

(Excerpt from the minutes of the Wisconsin Pastoral Conference of 1862.)

------The importance of the subject touched upon here (by the lecture of the Rev. X.) now called forth a long and lively exchange of opinions in the Conference, which, however, revolved chiefly around the proper settlement of the following three points to be considered in this connection:

1. Whether the worldly dance is sin;
2. whether the unrepentant persistence in this sin entails the banishment; and
3. how those are to be treated who, out of weakness, are tempted and enticed now and then to take part in so-called casual dances.

As to the first proposition, whether the dancing in question is a sin, Rev. Fürbrlnger's opinion on dancing, given by letter and already discussed once before, was read out again, as well as a passage from Dr. Luther's writings and a statement by Joh. Ambach from 1543 from "Spener's theol. Bedenken". The discussion that followed resulted in the following overall conclusion: not dancing in itself, but dancing as is customary in the world (as occurs especially here in America) is a wicked and grave sin, or, to be even more precise, participation in the dances of the world becomes a sin for a Christian because the same dancing is connected with circumstances that are sinful. These circumstances, which are sinful in themselves, were then particularly emphasized; e. g., how, as a rule, one finds together on the dance floors only open enemies of the church and despisers of God, yes, in many cases not only worldly children and carnal men par excellence, but quite degenerate, raw whoremongers. From such people and societies was to be derived the formation of today's dance, stripped of all beauty, breeding, manners and shamefacedness, which could by no means be compared with the demure dances of the past, cultivated primarily for the sake of art and gymnastics. In this connection it was remarked what sins, vices, and disgraces were wont to go hand in hand with the actual dancing, even in ordinary ball-rooms, as, for instance In almost all cases, however, fornication was the goal and ultimate purpose of these dancing parties, through whose participation not only the soul but also the body entered the service of the devil and had to lose its health and perish. If these circumstances are taken into consideration, it is clear that it is impossible for a Christian to participate in such a crude carnal pleasure as the worldly dance without grievous injury to his conscience and great annoyance to others, and in sum, without sin. For this participation

leads straightway, apart from the annoyance it causes and the damage it does to the health of the body, against the fifth commandment, to the equalization of the world, to the profanation and denial of God's name against the second commandment, in many cases to the desecration of Sunday (and church feast days) against the third commandment, and to arrogance, gluttony, fornication (adultery), and other immorality against the sixth commandment. One should only "consider" that even to respectable worldly children the dancing of our time is an object of mockery and disgust. Such circumstances, however, make dancing, which is sinless in itself, a grave and many-sided sin.

The second point, whether the unrepentant persistence in the sin of this (worldly) dancing entails the ban, was considered more closely. Reference was made to professional dancers, to those who, despising all instruction and admonition, and forcibly stifling the voice of their conscience, take every opportunity with lust and avidity to groan with the children of the world in the dancing dens of the lust of the eyes and the lust of the flesh, and yet insist on their Christian liberty before the congregation, reference being made to the miserable condition of the heart of such people. Let us "consider" how all the circumstances connected with worldly dancing are such gross and obvious sins that they disgust even respectable worldly children, not to mention that they must shine brightly in the eyes of even the most enlightened Christian mind, and how a man who remains in this sin and seizes every opportunity to commit it anew without penitent repentance must therefore work and rebel against the Spirit of God. To this must be added the continual vexation which is thereby given to the congregation and to others, as well as the perpetual evil example which the more mature youth of the congregation, in particular, run the risk of following and thus falling into the same sins. Such men, then, who evidently and persistently let the sins of denial, blasphemy, pride, fornication, and equality with the world reign over them, and thus reveal that they are no longer under the rule of grace and the government of the Holy Spirit, but want to remain and persist in the bonds of sin and the devil, are to be put out of the church of Christ as "evil" and certainly belong in the ban, And the seriousness of such discipline is all the more necessary, the more terrible and devastating this sin eats away like a cancer today and gnaws away at the lifeblood of the congregations, and the greater the dullness of consciences and the indifference to it often is, especially in those congregations which, according to their position of knowledge, are to be counted among the supported ones.

Now, as to the third point, namely, the procedure to be followed with those who, as so-called occasional dancers, here and there (about once a year), for lack of knowledge and weakness of the flesh, take part in such dances, which, for instance, are performed by closed companies (firemen's companies).

on special occasions (annual or foundation celebrations etc.), however, with more outward order and decency than those parties in the dance halls.) are, however, held with more outward order and decorum than those banquets in the dance halls, or with those who abstain from dancing here, but nevertheless believe they must be present for some obligation, the judgment of the Conference, after a lengthy and detailed discussion of specific cases, agreed that, for the sake of the extenuating circumstances prevailing here, in accordance with justice, a more lenient procedure should also be observed, without prejudice to all seriousness in the treatment, and the opinion expressed by some members of the conference that all dancers should be dealt with summarily and that church discipline in the third degree should be applied equally to these dancers as well as to those in the habit, - was rejected by explaining how difficult it still is for many people to be punished, how difficult it still is for many Christians, accustomed in Germany from their youth to unhindered and never censured dancing, to understand the unholy nature of dancing in itself, with the intrinsically sinful circumstances that make it sinful in the first place, and which accompany participation in it, such as, for example, equality with the faithless. For example, equality with the faithless and godless world. Therefore, taking into account all the individual cases in their peculiarity, one must try to sharpen the conscience of these people more and more by teaching and exhortation in an evangelical way, and by presenting to them the glory of their Christian profession, one must try to instill in them a right disgust, to sit together with mild scoffers and unbelievers only once a year, yes, even only once at all (Ps. 1.) and to dance, which, after all, is undoubtedly also an assimilation to the world and consequently sin. No such known cases of participation in dances of this kind should be allowed to pass without serious reproof, renewed admonition, warning, and punishment from God's Word; they should be stopped, and thus wait for improvement, i.e., for the complete denial of these carnal desires.

To the question raised here, what should happen to those who vowed to amend, but refused to make public apology before the assembled congregation in accordance with the congregational order, - it was only answered: here, according to the more or less of the repetition of the dancing in view of a greater or lesser arousal, and above all, taking into account what just in individual cases the congregation, as well as the person to be punished piously, a just difference, i.e. a milder or stricter discipline, to hold, e.g. apology before the church council (Vorsteher-Collegium), or before the congregational assembly, or before the entire congregation. The church council (Vorsteher-Collegium), or the congregational assembly, or the entire congregation, either through the pastor or in person, and in general to make an exception to the existing congregational rules on church discipline where it is necessary and beneficial. ----------

Litterary Intelligences.

Drunken Science and its Legacy to the Evangelical Church. In letters by Dr. Carl Scheele, professor. Berlin by Schlawitz. 1867. 289 pages in large 8.

In a review of this paper in the Guericke'sche Zeitschrift (I. Quartalbeft of 1869) Lic. Ströbel and others write the following:

In the discordant concert of Lutheran dogmatists, only one voice of a firm Lutheran sound can be heard, the voice of the author of the text: "Die trunkene Wissenschaft" ("Drunken Science"), for whom there are no more problems of theology, but only one problem, to deny everything that theologians of newer schools say." Thus the Neue Evang. Kirchenzeitung (No. 9 of 1868, p. 141) comments on the present "Contribution to the Evaluation of the Newer Theology." A fine praise, especially from such a mouth! And well deserved! For we are indeed dealing with an epoch-making book, with a writing that does not yet have its equal - at least not in the last hundred years. It will also hardly be surpassed, but certainly never refuted; to its opponents only the tried and tested means of deathly silence is to be recommended: any attempt at refutation would only result in disgrace and harm to "science. Tangible facts and truths made tangible can no longer be denied. To write books like the "drunken science" is a work for which God must specially select and enable his people. This is evidently what happened to Prof. Scheele. His whole course of life and study was, unconsciously, directed towards this task. He has made the most intimate acquaintance with all of modern theology and philosophy, and because he understands both of them down to their most secret roots, he is also able to impart to others a sure judgment of them, since he has also been given the gift of light discussion and profound criticism to a degree that is seldom found. Moreover, he is related to the nobler and deeper spirits of all times: to Plato, Pascal, Hamann, Claudius, also to Göthe, Schiller, Lessing and others. For the most part, however, he knows how to illuminate the aberrations of the "modern worldview" with a biblical torch, and how "drunken science" has already deprived countless people of peace in this world and blessedness in the next, and how the German people, with the continued cult of this "science," are approaching an inevitable end with terror. While it is to be feared that this prophetic voice will find no other fate among the majority of our contemporaries than that of Cassandra and Jesus Anani, we nevertheless consider it necessary to call the attention of at least the minority to the testimony that has been given, to the watchman's call from the pinnacle of the tower of time that may have sounded at the eleventh or twelfth hour. We think that these 24 letters of Prof.

Scheele to a student of theology should not only be read by those who are still at the "seat of the Muses", but by every scholar of God, and should consider it carefully; no one will consider the time spent on it wasted. . .. So much for the merits of Sch.'s book; in the interest of truth, however, we must add the following. The Neue Evang. K.-Zeitung (op. cit.) states thus: Prof. Sch. does indeed fight modern theology; "alone even he has not yet revealed what for him is Lutheran tradition. And if he should be sober enough to perceive what breaches Hengstenberg and others have made in Lutheranism, he will no doubt include them in the comradeship of his title in the next edition of the book." This, to be sure, is mostly unionist tendency-dissatisfaction; but an "if?" still remains in it as a grain of truth. What do we do with the inspired "erring" of St. Scripture? (p. 250), what with the "need of supplementation of the ecclesiastical confessions" (p. 254)? what with the "custody in regard to Dr. Beck" (Letter 1.)? what with the specific state doctrine (p. 48 and others)? what with the ominous "Larifari" (p. 257 f.)? Is the latter merely a censure of the hollow rhetoric that is now spreading in new evangelical church newspapers and Oberkirchenrathsdenkschriften? or is it at the same time valid in the sense of that famous "historian" from whom it originated, and who authentically interpreted it through the well-known Erfurt Conferences? In short, it remains questionable whether Dr. Sch. bends the Bible under the Church, the Gospel under Tradition, Christian Protestantism under Prussian Conservatism; questionable how he thinks of *Papa* and *Apap*; questionable whether he recognizes the intimate kinship of "drunken philosophy and theology" with the Union, and the latter with the politics of legitimacy; questionable whether he regards liberalism and democracy for the parents, or for the children of "drunken science**; questionable whether he believes that we owe this staggering Berauscherin not to the "people," but exclusively to the "Gottesgnadenkönigthum" of Frederick II. and Frederick William III; in any case it is questionable whether he has looked only to the left into the gruesome Charybdis, or whether he has also looked to the right into the at least equally gruesome Scylla. That is why we, too, long for a second edition of the book, hopefully soon to be published, which may solve those questions satisfactorily for us."

Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Halle-Wittenberg union. Festive report by Prof. Dr. W. Beyschlag, d. Z. Prorektor. Halle, 1867.

We only list this work here among our literary intelligences in order to take this opportunity to share with our readers some of the excellent reviews of this work by Lic. In it, Ströbel writes, among other things, the following:

The first note of opposition to Wittenberg was struck by Tho-

luck. As a preacher in the academic service of the "Vortag" he let himself be heard thus: "We theologians of Halle Wittenberg" want to thirst for the knowledge of the salutary truth; "in this striving those men of honor of the most beautiful time of Wittenberg" (as if that were not only the time of the Reformation - the Red), "a Balthasar Meißner, a Wolfgang Franz - a Cornel. Martini should be our examples." "But our cautionary examples should also be the Calove and Deutschmann of the last days of Wittenberg's greatness, the men of a theology which, were it also in the best opinion, secirte the leaves of the tree of life, that the dryad in it wept for mercy. To the theologians of this race, when they now rise again among us, let us cry out: You have already been there, you sylph-stealers and judges of splinters, and have had to surrender your scepter to a theology that has placed faith, which is active in love, on its banner as a solution. Why should our old faithful scholars of God have been by all means "sylph-stealers and judges of splinters"? Because they applied the well-known saying of the poet, "Do not deviate a finger's breadth from God's ways," also to their teaching office, to the proclamation of the "ways of God"? This deserves imitation, especially in our day, when the great majority of people know no other opposition to "sylph-stealing and splinter-teaching" than indifferentism and lack of religion. And does it bring any shame or embarrassment to our Lutheran theologians of today that they have "already been there"? On the contrary! The Reformers, after all, considered it vain glory and good fortune to understand by gospel and Christian theology something other than the Athenian inclination to "always say or hear something new". Would to God I had half the faith and knowledge of a Calov! . Nowhere, least of all in spiritual things, is "new " a praise, and "old" a censure. On good and bad, on true and false, everything depends "in the realm of the spirit." Why, then, does the festive address not designate the opposition of the two universities in words with which certain concepts, concrete religious notions, are connected? Wittenberg as the representative of Protestant faith, Halle as the representative of rationalist unbelief, - that is, after all, the core of Dr. Beyschlag's nebulous terminology and ghostly paraphrasing. And how easily comprehensible then is all that belongs here! Just as at Wittenberg the various degrees of faith (from Luther to Reinhard), so at Halle the various stages of unbelief (from Thomasius to Schleiermacher; A. H. Francke is not considered by Dr. Beyschlag to be a bearer of the Hallic spirit, and we pass over the later theological luminaries of the nineteenth century with deliberate silence) had to be expressed. How weak, then, is, for example, the reproach against Wittenberg: "Not the heroes, only the athletes of Lutheran orthodoxy belong to it, no Joh. Gernard, but an Abr. Calov, who has the whole *rabies theolo-*

gica -" etc. Poor Calov, you are being horribly dragged about in your coffin! You must have a good skin, or it would have long since been turned to shreds! But I would like to know with whom the "heroes" Mart. Luther and the one in Jena would have preferred to fraternize with, whether with you contemptible "athlete," or with the highly famous "hero" Karl Bahrdt, - whom Halle calls his own. Don't worry about *the* "*rabies theologica,*" old Dr. Abraham; that is a fashionable compliment of the 19th century, and merely says that you are spoiled as a "modern world-viewer. Well, that's no misfortune... . . But God allowed the "Luther University" to perish, so that it would not even be tempted to fall away from the Gospel; the "Cradle of the Reformation" was not to become a gymnasium of religious warfare, and no unionist was to sit on Luther's chair. ... But the "obligation" (to the symbols)? Wonderful objection! A creed, to which no one is to profess, is what simple common sense still called in 1780 a "*sideroxylon,*" a sword without hilt or blade. Yes, but the general academic obligation? Well, why must a Catholic, Reformed, Jewish, in short a non-Lutheran "fencing master" function at a Lutheran university? Or why should just the "stable master" have a special right to mock religion and blaspheme? Why should just the "philosophers" and "physicians" be allowed to compliment a disliked theologian, according to royal procedure, as "Mucker Francke" and the like? There is no good reason for such exceptions.... But the "armored dress"? Yes, precisely the "armor dress"! Chiliastes and neo-principles may consider the Christian church before the last day as a "garden of paradise", to the apostles it is only considered a "fortified camp", an *ecclesia militans,* which should never take off the "armor"; Eph. 6, 10-17. Of course, the "symbolic armor" is not made of "neo-logical" material, otherwise one would gladly put up with it. In that case, however, it could not even have defied "Calixt's humanistic unionism," let alone today's Pavianist enlightenment. - But, but the "seeds of discord in the formula of concord"!? No, no! The Unionists are only 'too eager to give us a blue haze about these circumstances. The *Form. Conc.* could not sow discord (for it had been sown long ago), therefore we can see no such seed in the book. The "discord" exists only between the prophets and apostles on the one hand, and Zwingli, Calvin, and their followers on the other. Luther, the Concordia formula, and "orthodoxy" have nothing whatever to do with the quarrelsome trade; - what is the business of the bread-buyer's quarrel with his concurrents? .... The old trick of calling the "orthodox" the apostles, for one thing, has become too flimsy; that is why one fights out the quarrel with the real adversary and does not push other people into the hole.... . With the above in mind, the festive speech further tells us: "Thus, with the transformation of the evangelical

The fact that the faith of the Catholic Church in the symbolic orthodoxy had a fertilizing effect on the life of the spirit as a whole, which, in the face of external doctrinal intimidation, rather developed a resentful urge for liberation." These are fantasists! Even Hase says about the "symbolic orthodoxy": "If dogmatics moved toward two centuries in the sanctioned formulas, then this was desirable through the joy of the hard-won battle prize, through religious depth and systematic consistency of this system, partly natural, partly for the historical foundation of the church, which without it could not cope with the excentric change of systems of our time, as well as necessary through the political conditions for religious peace. Although theology seemed to freeze, the Christian life remained devout and intimate, as is already evident from the wealth of pious hymns from this time." .. . The festive speech continues: "When, from the midst of theology itself, ever more emphatic oppositions arose against this theological domination, it is Wittenberg above all that defends it as its own God-given privilege." O place these words on Wittenberg's tombstone! You cannot pay greater homage to the *alma mater in* the grave! It is truly as the invectives say. To be a tower of rock for German Christianity against the violent and cunning attempts of the Papists, the Calvinists, the Pietists, the Unionists, the heavenly prophets of all times, names and shades; - to carry on a brazen shield the slogan: "God's word is Luther's doctrine, therefore it never perishes;" - in the struggle with the anti-God dignities of the upper and lower worlds, neither to flee, nor to be bent, but to stand steadfast, or to break, - that was Wittenberg's peculiar task from 1517 to 1812, which it also endeavored to fulfill faithfully, to which even his opponents are witnesses, according to the respective measure of its gifts and powers. No wonder that the faithful university was, is and will be an unbearable thorn in the side of many!

Bible and Nature in the Harmony of their Revelations. By Ch. Zollmann, Lutheran pastor at Buenos Ayres. Hamburg, Rauhes Haus. 1869. 280 S.

This writing is a new proof of how deceptive the titles of books often are and how they not infrequently contain everything the opposite of what their title promises, even if, like the one shown, it is even a prize writing (crowned by the Central-Ausschusse für innere Mission). How it looks with the "harmony", which the author promises to prove, can be seen from the fact that he claims, according to Dr. Münkel's report, that the natural view of the Bible can be compared in many and even important parts with the natural view of the Bible.

do not hold. "For instance, he strikes out the very first leaf of the Bible from the series of historical facts, and this stroke is prolonged quite a way through the Bible, without our foreseeing its end. The Bible is the document and source of religion,' he says. What it contains beyond this may be valuable in some respects, but it does not bind faith, and is left to free examination and direction." But what kind of faith this is, which examines and sifts the contents of the Bible itself, the naive harmonist does not say. W.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

The English Unitarians have officially invited the German Rationalists of the Free Christian Prot. League in Cincinnati to attend their conference in Janesville, Wisc. these days. They promise them a collecte to cover their travel expenses.

(Evangelist.)

Colleges. In the English Eastern church papers, Dr. Nevin and other distinguished men advocate that our colleges should be changed after the manner of the Prussian grammar schools, and generally give the highest praise to the German system of education. They say that the American schools teach too many things and are not thorough. One should confine oneself to fewer subjects, especially to the classical languages and mathematics, and so on. These are the same ideas we seek to follow in the Calvin Institute. (Evangelist.)

"Der Lutherische Kirchenfreund" (The Lutheran Church Friend) is the title of the new organ of the old General Synod for the Germans, now published in its first number in Indianapolis, Ind. The paper immediately makes its confession of religion and faith on the title with the words: "On the stand of the General Synod." Immediately after this, of course, follows as a motto; "We believe in a holy Christian church"; but this Roman papist creed is probably only an oversight, and the first of the venerable RtdactionS-Committee. The second oversight may be the following statement on the second page: "He," the Church Friend, "calls himself 'Lutheran' because his readers are Lutheran" (surely a strange reason!), "and because his ecclesiastical standpoint has been known as -Lutheran, for 300 Iyears." (surely even stranger! - At least to us this has not yet been known; we have also been able to spy nothing of the "church friend" in all church-historical documents of the last 300 years). The editor seems to feel something of a prophet in him; he writes: "In our heart lies the prophecy that something great will yet become of the 'Lutherischer Kirchenfreund'"; but probably the modest writer means by this only a large format; and if enough money flows to him, why should this not have been able to open a "prophetic" vein in him? Very reassuring is the explanation: "Since this paper is not edited by one hand, it is relieved of the danger of becoming one-sided, unjust, and biased." Admittedly, the conclusion is not exactly based on strong logical foundations; hopefully, however, the will is stronger. Incidentally, the paper seems to want to equip the department headed "Welt" and "Landwirthschaftliches" with special care. We wish the editors all the best, and we hope above all that they will soon leave the vacillating position they have taken and stand with us on the firm stand of the pure confession. - After the foregoing had already been written, we received

the second number of the "Kirchenfreund", in which the same, under the heading: "Unser Standpunkt" (Our standpoint), already comes out more clearly with the language, among other things in the following words: "Echt lutherisch will der Kirchenfreund sein; aber eben deshalb nicht in dem Sinn, in welchem der Name nach der Reformation so oft gemißbrauchen wurde, im Interesse einer zänkischen, exclusiven Rotte. Not only have different opinions on unessential articles been and allowed in the Lutheran Church, but it belongs essentially to the true liberty of the Lutheran Church that such diversities must be tolerated." The "Church Friend" seems to have gone to school with the Iowans, except that he may be making a different selection in the "non-essential doctrines." W.

Protestant Ecumenical Council. The "*Lutheran*" of 7 Jan. notes almost at the same time that the Pope had announced a council to be held in Rome in December of next year, that a Protestant council was also being planned to be held in New York next fall. The thought of this has aroused great enthusiasm in the various branches of the Protestant Alliance. The "*Lutheran*" says: "That all Protestant churches have a great common interest is undeniable, and so far as the same can be promoted by co-operation, it is evidently both a duty and a privilege to seize every opportunity which presents itself for this purpose. There are also doctrines which are held in common, etc., though we incline to the opinion that the proposed Conciliar could do no better than by simply recognizing the apostolic symbol as the common symbol of all Christian Churches." The latter, of course, would be the simplest thing if all the so-called Christian churches really accepted the apostolic symbol in the same sense. But since, as is well known, this is not the case, a "formal union of all Protestants" in the profession of that symbol, which the pope also formally recognizes, would be nothing less than an imposing demonstration to the pope; apart from the fact that it could not please God if the so-called Protestants sought in this way to give themselves the appearance of a certain unity in the faith, while one interprets the symbol in this way, the other in that way. Let us leave the pope his apparent unity, and let us not be tempted by it to try to counteract him by imitating his comedy, though a little better. W.

Church Council. The Independent, too, had asserted that the Council's resolutions on the four points appeared to be deliberately ambiguous about them, and, as the *Lutheran* had declared this assertion to be "*unfair,*" the *Independent* had referred to the testimony of the *Observer*, the *Standard,* and the Church Gazette. The "*Lutheran*" of Jan. 7 does not show how unambiguously and unequivocally the resolutions express what all the members of the *Council* wanted to confess in one sense and one opinion, but writes, among other things: "The General Council is large and respectable enough to be vetoed, judged by its own official statements and by the representations of its friends. When the religious public of this country better understands the true position of the General-Concil, they will find more to admire in it than said bodies are capable of finding." - We remember, this would better be heard from the mouth of an outsider, than from that of a principal member of the Council (Insulanus-Krotel). *Propria laus sordet*. - The "Congregational Journal of the Wisconsin Synod" of Jan. 1 writes: "The resolutions of the last General Church Meeting at Pittsburg have met with various receptions. We are surprised at the news in the 'Lutheran Magazine' that the Iowa Synod has expressed joy and satisfaction over the resolutions. We are eager to hear what direct statements will be made by the Honorable Iowa Synod concerning the said resolutions. - It seems to us that the ground which is built is rather broad than firm. We shall soon take occasion to point out something of the uncertain places."

II. Abroad.

Spurgeon, the famous Baptist preacher, declared that he would no longer use wine and ale only as a medicine, but regularly as a drink. On the other hand, the Catholic. Archbishop of Westminster (England), Dr. Manning, has taken the vow of temperance.

Prayers from Older Times. In a review of the "Ev. Haus- und Handbuchs von E. Ohly (Wiesbaden bei Niedner 1866)", which contains many prayers taken from older prayer books, E. Engelhardt rightly remarks: "As far as the authenticity of the prayers is concerned, a comparison with other collections shows that our newer collectors have still not come to the strictness with which the original text of our songs has now been restored. But this is also necessary, for when I read the prayer of an old man, I would like to be sure that I am really reading it in the form in which he spoke it, and not in arbitrary changes. Furthermore, we would very much have liked to read the names of their authors among the prayers. It uplifts the soul to know that this prayer has been going up to God from the mouths of the saints for centuries." What Engelhardt exhibits here in Ohly's prayer book is also a shortcoming of Löhe's otherwise in so many ways excellent prayer collections. The uncertainty as to whether one is praying with the words of an old divine scholar or with Löhe's words, whether here and there something has been omitted, inserted or changed, has something disturbing in its use. W.

Theology. In the Guericke'schen Zeitschrift of this year, p. 118, there is a review of the speech with which Prof. v. Zezschwitz! took up his professorship in Erlangen, by A. Althaus. In it we read: "Both, the scientific consciousness of theology in general and the scientific form of practical theology, according to the author's account, date only from more recent times. (However, thank God!) "As a science to be applied, it has only taken the run-up through the time direction to the absolute." (Namely since Hegel and Schleiermacher.) "Theology (says Z.) in general - dogmatics and ethics - has become speculative theology. Would that no one suspected this gift by a *timeo Danaos*. "The speaker," remarks Althaus, "shows, however, in it (the Rede) in many respects a figure not hitherto seen in him; certainly it is surprising to find even a Zezschwitz on this track; one hoped that the same would place himself in the ranks of those theologians who seek to preserve to theology its character as a *habitus practicus ὑ-εόζδοτος* still now, as
the blessed Rudelbach, but instead he rejoices over the gift brought to theology by the enemy of being a science, and declares that he wants to join the ranks of those who seek to make this new alleged elevation of status, which is nothing other than its dissolution, the truth for theology. Althaus, too, remarks in his review: "As far as his (the speaker's) view of theology in general, as speculative theology, is concerned, the speaker cannot entirely escape the *timeo Danaos.*

W.

Switzerland. A correspondent reports in the Hengstenbergische Ev. Kirchenzeitung: "A beautiful and important enterprise, whose patrons admittedly mostly belong to the Free Church, is the collection of letters of the Reformers, *Correspondance des Reformateurs, which has* been published for three years and whose publication has been entrusted to a very talented, diligent and conscientious Vaudois clergyman, Herminjard. Of this work, which is to have 10 volumes, 2 volumes have already appeared, and it is generally acknowledged that they present very valuable, in part completely new material on the history of the Reformation; the letters are arranged chronologically and provided with excellent introductions and explanations. From the study of these sources, however, the fact arises that the history of the Reformation in French countries must be, as it were, completely rewritten, and that especially the "'History of the Reformation" by Merle d'Aubigne, which in some circles, and especially in England and America, has such a

The book, which has gained a great reputation, contains much that is based on mere hypotheses or rather gross misunderstandings and bears the character of a novel more than that of history. Events and people appear from the ***Correspondanceoften*** quite differently than Merke thought of and portrayed them.

Death. On December 10 of last year, Dr. F. W. Krummacher died quickly and unexpectedly at the age of not quite 72.

Professor Lipsius in Kiel has been removed from the scientific examination board because of his involvement in the Bremen Protestant Day. A small beginning to purge the Prussian Protestant Church of rationalists. If this is to be taken seriously, the Oberkirchenrath would have a truly Herculean task ahead of him.

Hesse-Darmstadt. Münkel reports: The largest part of this country is Lutheran. About a quarter of the inhabitants are Catholics, the other part are Reformed, Uniate, sects and Jews. The city of Darmstadt is united, except for the Court Church, which remains Lutheran. All the Protestants (Lutherans), however, are under a united regime. The unbelievers now want to introduce the Union in the whole country by a general synod. The Lutherans would like to eliminate the Union in the High Consistory and therefore protest against a joint Synod with the Uniate and Reformed. The church government oppresses the Lutherans, formerly favored the rationalists, but has now turned its favor to the mediators. The Orthodox, however, like the children of Israel in Egypt, are growing under the pressure. Now the question is whether the Oberconsistorium can lavir here longer.

Catholicism in England. J. Wallis, since 1856 editor of the English Catholic organ "Tadlet" has resigned from the editorial office because the Catholic public was no longer satisfied with him and accused him of having changed. He claims, however, that the opposite is the truth. He writes: "I believe that very many Catholics have changed, namely in the direction away from absolutism in religious and towards democracy in political terms." On this Münkel quite correctly remarks: "Complete freedom is wanted in the state, so that one can establish unconditional church rule over the people." When Rudelbach gave the signal for the struggle for state religious liberty in Germany 28 years ago, he declared at the same time that the "Papacy needed religious liberty only as a cover for its lusts to rule." All the sympathies of the Romans with freedom here have no other motive. W.

Union and Confession. Just as the Reformed once declared themselves willing to profess the Augsburg Confession in order to enjoy the religious peace and its privileges under its protection, a part of the Prussian-Unionist regional church has recently declared itself willing to profess the Augsburg Confession, not because they should have finally recognized it as a thoroughly pure confession, for then the Uniate would have to confess his Union and the Reformed his Zwinglianism and Calvinism as a guilt ready to repent, but in order to lure also the Lutherans into the Union house under the banner of the Augustana and then to be able to live in it unchallenged. According to the "Immanuel", this attitude was clearly expressed in a meeting of 160 former cathedral candidates and other unchurched preachers, which was presided over by the court and cathedral preacher W. Hoffmann in the cathedral candidates' seminary in Berlin on October 15 of last year. Consistorialrath Schultz from Posen had the task to speak of the "necessity to use the Augsb. Conf. as the common confession of the Lutheran Church. This necessity lay not in the faith and conscience of its members, that they "confessed": "We cannot leave it alone" - but, as the author of the thesis clearly said: in the ecclesiastical present. And this situation demands the Lutheran confession, in order that other people, the Lutherans in Holstein, Hanover, and Hesse, may better be caught up in the Union. His fifth thesis reads most naively: "Among the causes driving this, the need for a union between the old and new Prussian territories stands at the top. The first cause is the need for an ecclesiastical union between the old and the new Prussian territories.

fusion." Thesis 9 reads: "In the face of the insolence of the latest allocation directed to the Protestants by the Papal See, it would be an uplifting response if on December 8, 1869, not only the Lutheran Regional Church of Prussia, but the entire Lutheran Church of Germany, through the mouth of its ecclesiastical governing bodies, solemnly renewed its unanimous confession before God and man. One sees from this how little is often to be given to the so-called "unanimous confession" when it is based only on a unanimous tendency, not on unanimous faith. Such a confessional union, toward which everything is now striving, is not to be joyfully welcomed as the dawn of a better time, but rather as something to be feared, whereby the last deception becomes worse than the first. W.

A verdict on this year's Catholic General Assembly in Bamberg is published in the Catholic Kölner Blätter with the following introductory words: "It is impossible to conceal the fact that this year's Catholic General Assembly also passed without any notable success. It cannot be seen that only the appropriate motion of Volks: the brochure published in Münster about the lack of success of the Catholic General Assemblies in recent years should not remain completely unnoticed, received any attention in the assembly.

(Münkel's Ztbl.)

Synodal Constitution. From the Weimar, the Ev. Kz. is written: "It seems that the hot urge for synodal constitution is dying out. 6 years ago all the pastors of my diocese rose up except 2, when they voted on the benefit of the Synod; a few days ago only 2 rose up when they voted for a new petition."

The spirit of New Protestantism is also stirring in Sweden, in the midst of the Lutheran national synod recently held once again for a long time. The main event of this synod was the motion of Victor Rydberg, author of the book: "The Biblical Doctrine of Christ"; to subordinate the authority of the symbolic books to that of the Bible in the spiritual oath of office. The majority of the Old Believers rejected the proposal, but for this very reason a movement has arisen which will not rest until the goal is reached. Rydberg has thus become the acknowledged leader of the ecclesiastical liberal party, and even the old University of Upsala has taken his side. (Ref. Kz.)

The Danish Church Commission, which holds its meetings in the Amalienburg Castle, is busy discussing a reform of the Lutheran Church, which covers the following topics: Church constitution with representative bodies; assemblies of the church council; change in the way clerical offices are filled; stricter and more regular supervision of the pastors; church courts to pass judgment on offences committed by clergymen; changed way of paying clergymen; abolition of the laws which make the contracting of marriages, etc., subject to the execution of the law. The Council of Ministers is expected to discuss these matters in the course of the next session of the General Assembly. The deliberations on these matters are likely to last until the spring of this year, which is why the draft of the new church constitution cannot be presented until the next Imperial Diet.

(Ref. Kz.)

To the many sects which have already caused the Russian state church many inconveniences, there has recently been added one in Sarapul which, acknowledging only God, has abolished everything else, prayer, going to church, images of saints, etc., so that the government has seen fit to throw the heads of this sect into prison. The mass of those who had already fallen away now demanded that they should be imprisoned together with their leaders, which was done, as far as the lockable space sufficed. Attempts to convert them to the State Church failed, until at last the authorities interfered and by very forceful means induced each individual to renounce his heresy and return to the fold of the Church. Fifty of the leaders of this heresy, however, still sit and defy all attempts at conversion. (Ref. Kz.)

The death penalty is now also abolished in the Kingdom of Saxony.

Brunn on Iowa. The appraisal of the Colloquium by representatives of our Synod and the Iowa Synod, Brunn concludes in fine print (No. 8. 1868), as follows: "With the hope of still greater agreement in the future, the Colloquium was ended by both sides. One might well expect this complete agreement! After all, so much has already been conceded on the part of the Iowans that one would almost like to ask, what is still preventing the agreement? It can hardly be said that real doctrinal differences still offer a reason for separation; it can only be due to what Prof. Walther occasionally expresses, namely, to a difference of spirit which is still found between Iowans and Missourians. And this difference is especially apparent to us in one thing, that the Iowans lack just that which especially characterizes the Missourians and which we do not find anywhere in all the statements of the Iowans: the decided breaking with the false theology of modern times and the false directions that have arisen from it. That is why we do not hear a word of retraction from the Iowans about their earlier false positions and statements, but rather the effort to cover up the latter as much as possible and to present them only as misunderstandings; that is why we do not hear a word of complaint about the deep damage of the new theology, no testimony against the false teachings of the same, that is why we do not hear a whole and full heart for the pure Lutheran doctrine as the old fathers had it in the sixteenth century, and that is why we finally do not hear a true heartfelt move toward a true union with the Missourians. Let us not hide from ourselves the difficult position of the Iowans; they stand wedged between Missouri and Neudettelsau, their mother town. In the latter, however, they openly confess to this day that they are entirely far from the thought of a union with the Missourians, but want to continue their old way quite unchanged, as well as retain all their known peculiarities, and that they do not see the salvation of the church in the establishment of the pure doctrine of the sixteenth century, but in the toleration and balancing of the different theological directions within the Lutheran church of our time. Thus, on the one hand, the sect of Neudettelsau holds the Iowans from behind, while on the other hand, the Missourians push and drive them towards the unadulterated Lutheran confession, but in the middle stands the pressed heart and conscience and would like to do justice to both parts. This is the fluctuating middle position of the Iowans between Missouri and Neudettelsau, between the 16th and 19th centuries. At length this position, like any similar one, cannot endure. God help the Iowans in the hard fight! May he help them to victory in clarity and truth! But the latter can only be attained in humility and simplicity. To this may the gracious God help!" -

Zurich. The Synod assembled in Zurich at the end of October adopted a liturgy with double forms, one suitable for rationalists and the other for Bible believers. Every preacher may now choose such forms for the divine service and for the administration of the holy sacraments. The synod adopted a liturgy with two forms, one for rationalists and the other for biblical believers.

(Evangelist.)

Spain. In order to understand what a miracle the overthrow of the priestly party and of the Roman-minded Queen Jsabella is in this country, one must consider the following figures, which show the power of the priests: In the province of Galicia two-thirds of all lying property belongs to the priests. In all Spain one third. The annual revenue of the Roman Church in Spain amounts to 52 million piastres, while that of the secular government is only 21 million. In the last 35 years, according to the ***Dictionnaire of Canga Argelleg***, 140 million reales or 350 million francs
...was sent from Spain to Rome. (Evangelist.)

Hesse. As in Hanover, so also in Hesse the Union has brought struggle and hardship. Metropolitan (Sup.) Vilmar in Weisungen, whose brother was professor of theology in Marburg and died on July 30, 1868, has been removed from office for the second time by the Consistory in Cassel and this removal has been confirmed by Minister v. Mähler.

because of free expressions about violence of the year 1866, now because of opposition to union attempts. As a result of the annexation of Hesse into Prussia, the preacher and Consistorialrath Kratz in Cassel was appointed Prussian military chief preacher. Several Hessian pastors regarded this as a conversion to the Prussian Union - a kind of union had existed in Hesse for a long time - and demanded of Mr. Kratz in a letter of July 11, 1867, that he now also give up holding any office in the Lutheran Church. - Soon after, another member of the royal regiment, General-Sup. Martin in Casse!, published a pamphlet in favor of the Union, and thereby provoked a public counter-pamphlet from many pastors (including Vilmar's), in which they objected to all open and hidden Calvinism. Metropolitan Hoffmann had also spoken out against Martin's writing in a particularly decisive manner and was at first dismissed from his ecclesiastical supervisory office. His friends then called a conference and made a public statement to the effect that their steps to preserve the Lutheran church system in Lower Hesse had been displeasingly viewed and had even provoked the authorities to intervene against them, which they perceived with painful regret, but that their horrified colleague Hoffmann had acted rightly and had rendered essential services to the church by his actions. This was the signal for a sharper fight. The conference was immediately forbidden by the Consistory, and all metropolitans who took part in it were suspended from their office of supervision, because they had proved themselves incapable of being organs of the royal regiment. Most of them recanted, declared themselves docile to the royal regiment, and were reinstated in their offices. Vilmar, however, was a man, and confessed that he stood with his whole existence for the cause he represented. Thus he is now for the second time deposed from his office as Metropolitan, but left in the parish office. - The Consistory, however, assures us - we have also received such speeches from Breslau - that its action against Hoffmann and Vilmar is directed only against the inappropriateness of the form of their statements, and not in the least against the content. On the contrary, they had complete freedom to express their views, and to strive to bring these views to bear, as long as the limits imposed by ecclesiastical order and the position of the ecclesiastical authorities were observed. Well, we know that. Who does not know how the gentlemen in the regiment can forbid and punish any word for the sake of its unpopular content as one that violates form and is inappropriate? Form is held in the highest honor; content is given away. Thus one seems tolerant and can use violence. And such people still wonder at the distrust they find in all the upright? (Immanuel.)

France. In the January number of the "Schifflein Christi in Paris", an organ of the German Lutherans in France, the following is written in the entrance: "Today we would again have cause to worry and tremble, not so much for our sake as for the sake of our poor national church. While among us the discord continues and the misunderstandings come to an end and the indecision increases, outside the enemies are gathering closer and closer together and are preparing for a great attack on the church. In the name of freedom they want to forbid it to confess its creed, to sing its songs. And as in our country, so in Germany, too, the watchword is: "Away with the Lutheran Church!"

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume XV. **March 1869.** **No. 3.**

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 30.

A pastor must not think that he is fulfilling his ministry through public preaching alone. Private pastoral care and the home visits that become necessary as a result are also a duty that he must not shirk if he wants to be found to be a faithful steward.

Note 1.

Dr. Johannes Fecht writes about the necessity of private pastoral care: "*Sacerdotium* is not *otium* (the priestly office is not idleness) and it will not be easy for anyone who prefers such sweet rest to the spreading of the kingdom of God to deny that those are caught in a grave error who allow themselves to think that their office is best directed in all its parts, when they have preached their sermons from the pulpit, heard confessions, administered Holy Communion, and, when they were called to the sick, sometimes consoled them. For although the preaching of the divine word and the administration of the sacraments are rightly considered the chief office of the preacher, because of the divinity of the word which he preaches, and because of the divinely commanded exercise of public worship, yet there can be no doubt that it is an exceedingly pernicious error to include in it the whole office of pastor and guardian of the church; since it is self-evident that private instructions and exhortations, which are no less a part of the recital of the divine word, often promise no less fruit, because they are more penetrating to the hearer by their more confidential manner and personal application, and the form of question and answer awakens the attention which is sometimes lacking in sermons... Moreover, a kind of people has recently arisen in our church, who, while scorning the pure doctrine of the

We do not deny that there are not a few (which, alas, has been the case not only in our time, but in all times) who are in favor of stricter discipline in the church, for betterment. Nor do we deny that there are not a few (which, alas, has been the case not only in our time, but in all times) who care little for stricter discipline in the Church, for the improvement of the so corrupt morals of those entrusted to their care, for the implantation of a sincere love of God and of the divine Word. But those among us who, unaware of their office, care little for what they owe to God and their congregation, and thus give the separatists just cause to revile our church, will one day have to give God, the stern judge of the whole world, a serious and fatal account for it. *) Among the counsels which effect a thorough remedy and are truly wholesome, I reckon the house calls which are to be made by a church servant in his congregation. Scripture itself calls these the *ἐπισχοπή χατ οϊχους* (the oversight from house to house), by virtue of which one teaches in private dwellings," visits the house-churches, and there demands an account of the faith." (*Dissertatio de domestica auditorum visitatione etc*. 1708. Recorded by J. Glob. Pfeiffer in his *Miscellanea th. Lips*. 1736. p. 725 ff.).

On the same subject Deyling writes the following: "An evangelical pastor is obligated to instruct his audience not only publicly, but also *privately on* every occasion that presents itself to him, also to care for the individual and to apply to each person, who is entrusted to his faithfulness and supervision, according to the diversity of the dispositions (*ingeniorum*) and the circumstances, what is necessary for the promotion of his salvation. For the teachers of the word are called pastors, Ephesians 4:11. 4, 11. Therefore they must not only care for the whole flock, but also for each individual sheep. Therefore, if one of them goes astray, the shepherd seeks it out without delay, brings it back to the flock, strengthens it, and heals the sick. The servant of the word is appointed by God as a watchman in the church, according to the example of Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. 3, 17. 33, 7. 8. Is. 52 8. Jer. 6, 17. cf. Ebr. 13, 17. But how would he keep watch if he did not direct his watchman ministry to every single part, not to every member of the church? Furthermore, the pastor must give an account for each member of the whole congregation entrusted to him. Therefore he must also carefully explore the life of each one and inform him not only publicly but also privately.

*) What Fecht says about the trouble given to the separatists within the Lutheran Church is doubly true here in America of the sects surrounding the Lutheran Church and lying in wait for it.

The pastors are further called bishops, i. e. overseers, and they are commanded Apost. 20, 28. 1 Petri 5, 2. the *ἱπισχοπεῖν, i. e. the taking heed* or care, both specially (privatim), and publicly. They are also called God's fellow-laborers, 1 Cor. 3, 9. But as God is not only in general, but also in particular, earnestly intent on every individual man's blessedness, so also the minister of the word, as God's fellow-laborer, is bound to do the same. The Persian king Cyrus, if we may believe ancient documents, is considered worthy of praise because he knew the name of every soldier in his numerous army; cowherds and shepherds know each of their animals exactly and take care of each one, why not also a shepherd of souls for the souls bought by Christ's so precious blood? Thus the apostle Paul did not desist, both publicly, and especially from house to house (δημοσία *χαΐ χατ οιχους*), from exhorting every one (*ha ξχαστον*), Apost. 20, 20. 31. 1 Thess. 2. 10.; *) the same house calls and private exhortations, therefore, a church servant is obliged to make. This is inculcated by John Chrysostom in his 34th homily on the Epistle to the Ebraeans, where he says: 'You must one day give an account of everything and of every one entrusted to your care, wives, husbands, and children. Consider the danger you are in. It is to be wondered at when a priest becomes blessed.'" (*Institut. prudentiae pastoral. P. III, c*. 2. § 34. p. 338. f.)

The first among the theologians of our church who spoke out against the necessity of house calls on the part of the preacher was the well-known, otherwise so excellent theologian Dr. Arnold Mengering, last superintendent at Halle, who died in 1647. In his "Informatorium *conscientiae evangelicum*" he asks the question: "Whether a preacher, by virtue of his pastoral office, is bound in conscience to run after everything and everyone in house and court and to approach them in such a way as some misguided people claim?" Mengering answers this question in the negative. Already from the position of the question, however, one can see that the dear man was tempted to cross the right line by the concern that he would have to prove certain false spirits of his time right against the Lutheran Church. At that time a Weigelian had written a special book about the Lutheran church not being the true church, because it lacked the visits of the listeners in their homes, which were commanded by Christ more than the public preaching of the divine word. As seriously as Mengering therefore rejects the Weigelian, he nevertheless declares: "It would be well

*A strange example of the individual application of the word of God to single persons we have in the speech that is reported in Apost. 24, 24. 25. Paul's audience was his unjust judge Felix and his unchaste wife Drusilla; but the subject of his speech was: justice, chastity and the future judgment! Hence it is said, "Felix was afraid, and answered, Go thy way this time; and when I have convenient time, I will send for thee."

fine, that it could be like this everywhere" - "if they were accepted and introduced by the whole church, it would be desirable", etc. Yes, when Mengering, in his "*Scrutinium conscientiae catecheticum,"* comes to the question of private pastoral care, which is to be practiced on individual souls, he breaks out into the words: "I would like this question to be printed in red vermilion, I would like it to be inscribed with golden letters in all the study rooms and prayer chambers, I would like it to be engraved with iron pens and pointed diamonds on the tablets of the hearts of all pastors and parish priests, so that they would never again let such a question and question of conscience pass from their eyes and minds, hearts and thoughts. You should know, venerable pastor, that all the same souls in your congregation are commanded upon your souls and consciences, not only in general, but also to provide and supply each one of the same congregation *individually* with doctrine, comfort, instruction, admonition, and warning, as much as is humanly possible and possible, to direct your pastoral care and ministry to each one in particular, wherever it is necessary." (A. a. O. p. 1352.) Fecht therefore rightly remarks in his excellent dissertation cited above, in which he refutes Mengering's and L. Hartmann's objections, who follows the former in this: "It seems to us as if something human had happened to both in regard to this subject." (Pfeiffer's *Miscellan*. p. 798.) In order to judge Mengering and Hartmann correctly, it is also necessary to consider how large congregations, often consisting of thousands of souls, most preachers in Germany had. To them, of course, the imposition of having to follow all the individual souls into their houses must have seemed an unbearable burden. How could they have fulfilled this duty?

Note 2.

Concerning the proper nature of private pastoral care in general and of home visits in particular, Dr. Mich. Förtsch (last Prof. in Jena, d. 1724): "From what has been said, it is evident that a church servant must be careful with all diligence that he does not make himself unfit for public duties through private business, which happens, for example, when he spends his time with untimely visits or, to put the truth more clearly, with prowling around. This happens, for example, when he spends his time with untimely visits or, to state the truth more clearly, with wanderings under the pretext of having to direct his office to individual souls, and climbs the church pulpit without meditation and due study to preach extemporaneous and not at all meditated sermons; for what a great wrong is thereby committed against God and the congregation can be judged from the principles noted above." (*Dissertatio de privata fidelium in- stitutione*. 1691. p. Pfeiffer's *Miscellanea*, p. 695.)

Every preacher, but especially young and unmarried preachers, are to beware of too much familiarity with the

The apostle writes of the young women "as sisters with all chastity". When the apostle speaks of the practice of private pastoral care for the old and young, he writes of the young women that they are to be admonished "as sisters with all chastity. 1 Tim. 5, 1. 2. And of the false spirits of the latter times it is said, "Of the same are they that creep hither and thither into the houses, and lead captive the womenfolk, who are laden with sins, and run with divers lusts." 2 Tim. 3, 6. Not only must the preacher avoid every evil appearance to the utmost (1 Thess. 5, 22.) and strive to make everything "honest, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men" (2 Cor. 8, 21.), but the preacher must also be a good preacher.); the preacher must also be afraid of himself, and "consider" that Satan pursues him everywhere, to plunge him with the help of his flesh into sin and thus into disgrace, God's wrath and disfavor, death and damnation, and through him to mortally vex whole multitudes of weak Christians, but to harden the poor world. Finally, a preacher, in his official visits to homes, must also avoid the appearance of being particularly fond of visiting those homes where he finds pleasure. To the words, "But where ye go into a city or market, inquire whether there be any worthy therein; and abide with him until ye depart thence" (Matt. 10:11), Flacius, in his *Glossa N. T.,* makes the gloss, "*Prohibet, ne subinde lautiora hospitia quaerant," i.* e., he forbids them not to seek more splendid lodgings hereupon.

That the preacher has to direct his private pastoral care above all to the fallen does not need a detailed explanation. Osiander makes the following comment on Luke 15:4: "The human heart is of such a mind that it mourns over a lost thing more than it rejoices over the things it still possesses; so also Christ, the Son of God, is more concerned about the conversion of a sinner than about those who are already in God's sheepfold, although he also cares for them most diligently, Ezek. 34. 34. Therefore we also, especially we ministers of the church, must strive with the greatest diligence to call sinners back to repentance." (*Biblia ad 1. c.*)

To the question: "Whether a preacher is obliged to admonish his indolent parishioners and confessors, if they abstain from the reverend supper and live unrepentantly in their sins, each one individually and in particular, or whether it is enough what happens in the pulpit", is given in the first volume of this journal pp. 156-160, from the Dedekennus Vol. II, col. 745. ff. the thorough answer of the old Mansfeldian Dean Simon Musäus (d. 1582). Ibid. p. 344-346. his passage from Seckendorf's Christenstaat "Von den Hausbesuchen".

(To be continued.) ----------

(Submitted.)

To the author of the paper: "The lending of money on interests in the respect of the commandment of charity".

Werther Sir. In a paper published by you and circulated in our congregations, you have attacked the doctrine of usury treated of in our synodal papers, refuted it completely, as you believe, and driven your overcome opponents before your triumphal chariot with threatening brow and chiding words like a flock of sheep. You will permit me to follow your process, at least in this, that I address the following reply directly to yourself.

Since your writing aims to illuminate the disputed subject from the point of view of the Christian, I was especially disconcerted by your rejection and distancing of the holy Scriptures from this question concerning the will of God. You do away with the whole proof of Scripture with the words, "Whether interest and usury are synonymous in Hebrew, I do not know, nor is it indispensable for me to know," but you know very well that by the term Hebrew you designate the word of the living God, your Redeemer and Judge. To you, the judgment of right and wrong acquired in the course of business is so completely sufficient that you can very well dispense with the divine light. You seem to think it impossible that a Christian's conscience can be dulled by constant intercourse, practiced from youth, with an injustice that brings us not harm but advantage. Since the examples given seem to give you the clearest conviction, I will try to give you one. Think of yourself for a moment as a Christian missionary among a newly converted people, among whom thievery, as a by no means dishonorable thing, had been going on for centuries, and perhaps, as in ancient Lakonika, the youth were even encouraged to engage in it, in order to train them in agility of body and mind. Of course, you have the greatest moral abhorrence of this vice, as arguing against charity, and in order to guide the natural striving for possessions into other channels, you also distribute, for example, a translation of your writing, which explains charity with examples, as they are well understood even by very little supported Christians. You will, however, quite unexpectedly find opponents who try to prove to you that the practice of stealing confers many advantages on your people; it promotes a fairer equalization of property; it helps the poor to easily procure what they need for their livelihood; if someone falls short in this, it is at most the rich, but they, too, are at liberty to increase their wealth in the same way. Those who have too little understanding and skill to be able to make use of this means must seek to acquire the necessary skill, but until then they must work for others for a daily wage. They are also by no means so merciless as to leave the sick and completely incapable without help. Since, therefore, through their practice no one

but would especially benefit the poor, then it could not possibly be against charity. - They, quite astonished to see hints and teachings about charity perverted in your writing to the glossing over of a shameful vice, explain to them that every man capable of judgment must understand that the habit of satisfying one's own needs out of one's neighbor's property rather than out of one's own fortune is quite obviously contrary to charity. - Your opponents answer: "Look kindly at the examples which you give in your work to explain charity. In it you tell how in your country it works so beneficially that people run to capitalists, not once, but again and again for years, and ask them to lend them money at interest. They say themselves that these people are not crazy, that they would not voluntarily offer to pay annual interest to the capitalists if they wanted to pay this tax out of their own wealth. On the contrary, they intend to take this interest from their friends, the customers, by compelling them to pay the tribute promised to the capitalist, in addition to the real value of the goods and the just wages for toil, expenses, and the like. Now this practice of paying one's own debts out of the property of those who have neither borrowed nor promised anything to the capitalist, you will find in harmony with charity. We do likewise when we cover our debts and needs partly or wholly out of the property of our fellow citizens. - You, on the other hand, reply: That is something quite different. In our country this is balanced out, for all movable and immovable property is sold in such a way that the interest is included; the cleverer merchants do this knowingly, but the other merchants also, by taking the market price. - Very well, answers your opponent, the second takes out of the third's purse what he has had to pay the first too much, and the third out of the fourth, etc., so that really only he bears the loss who has not sense enough to do the same. Quite similar with us. In our country, since ancient times, every man has been permitted, without distinction, to use another's property to meet his own needs, so far as he is in need of it and can obtain it in a decent way. For it is only a disgrace to him who allows himself to be caught in the act. Thus all enjoy the same advantage, and only the unskilful man justly bears the loss, and he alone. - You are very mistaken, you say; stealing and borrowing money, but taking the interest for it from others, are very different things, which only malicious ignorance can equate. The same causes must also have the same effect. By stealing, the neighbor always becomes poorer, without any exception, while in our practice, as a rule, the neighbor does not become poorer, but in most cases always richer; as I can give you thousands and thousands of examples. - You are mistaken, replies the stiff-necked opponent, what you say contradicts

of our daily experience. Admittedly, for what we take from our neighbor, he becomes poorer, just as the buyer in your country becomes poorer for what is taken from him merely to satisfy the capitalist, to whom the seller has made himself liable to pay interest and for which the buyer receives no compensation. But since every one of us can do the same to his neighbor, and since we do not merely steal, but, as you see, also work, we thus procure for ourselves, in things that would otherwise lie quite unused, the means of so increasing our labor that we can do more in one year with their help than we could do in ten years without them with our two hands. - You only do not want to see the great difference, you cry indignantly; the thief comes to me against my will in order to steal from me, while the buyer in our country comes and asks the seller to let him have his goods, in spite of the markup on the interest. Have you ever heard of sensible people going to their neighbors and asking them to steal from them and reduce their property? - I cannot see the great difference," replied the other. Have you heard, for instance, that reasonable people may not buy anything from a merchant who wants to give them all his goods without the surcharge of interest, because they prefer to pay this interest? If they pay this mark-up, they do so, I think, because they must; otherwise they do not get what they need and desire. This, then, is the same voluntariness with which our neighbor lets himself be stolen from. He puts up with it if he cannot prevent it. He, in turn, allows himself the same right, and it is the custom of our country that when the theft has succeeded, no one can, or even wants to, force himself in any way to come to his own by any other way than that of theft. For since he wishes that what he has stolen should not be taken from him again, he will certainly not wish to change the custom of the country on account of what he has stolen. - They now give the people thorough proof of the injustice and shamefulness of their custom; that it is utterly contrary to charity; that all the rest of Christendom condemns it as a sin; that even well-mannered heathen everywhere have detested it as a shameful vice, etc.; but they receive the following answer: "Your harsh judgment of us is most uncharitable; we hold our old custom of the country to be lawful, and act accordingly. We have become just as capable of judgment through daily practice and experience as you, dear brother, who propound theories without practical knowledge and experience, and must explain to you that we are not in the least convinced by your repeated proofs that stealing is against charity. We must therefore ask you to treat this question with the greatest caution. For the question easily arises: Should you perhaps proceed as one-sidedly in your other teachings as you do in this one, which we can practically judge and in which it is impossible for us to agree? Moreover, we cannot accept your doctrine, just as we cannot accept the things you teach.

We are not allowed to do the same thing ourselves, if our property is used by others for their benefit, without going to the beggar's bar. So they weigh down our consciences, and tempt us to exercise our old practice with doubt; but what is done in doubt is sin to the Christian. And what do you prepare for yourselves? Confusion, obscurity, contradictions without end! - Now, if you saw that all your efforts failed with people who could only estimate moral demands according to the practical benefit or harm they cause in earthly possessions, you would certainly, at least at last, reproach them with the word of God, which expressly forbids theft, and to which they, as Christians, must absolutely submit, whether it brings them earthly advantage or disadvantage, agrees or does not agree with their views of charity. Now imagine that your opponents answered you again in the following way: God has revealed this word in the Hebrew language; now whether what it forbids is synonymous in Hebrew with what we do, we do not know, nor is it indispensable for us to know. But we may well test our practice by the precept of charity. We are not idiots; we know what we do. The thief and the one from whom it is stolen are equally capable of judgment, whether they harm themselves or not, and we know that in our circumstances this does not harm, but as a rule benefits everyone; and only an impractical theologian, like you, will want to deny this. - What you would now answer, I know not; for of this I found no intimation in your writing. Therefore I break off the example here.mDo not be angry with me, dear sir! that I have drawn almost the entire content of your writing into this single example. But I only wanted to show with this example that a Christian must never think that he can do without the Word of God in matters concerning God's will and commandment. We Christians should be planted like a tree by the stream of God's word, so as to draw the lifeblood of knowledge and practice from it, and not from our own opinions about loving our neighbor. For he who relies on his heart is a fool, says the Scripture, and it alone is the unmistakable lamp for our foot.

That the Scripture understands by usury nothing else than what was understood by it at the time when it was written, is evident. Now, if any one comes to the public with a writing on usury addressed to Christians, and does not know that Scripture is older than the custom of calling usury only that which exceeds the usury permitted by the State, he seems to me like one who publishes, say, a work of history in which he declares that he does not know whether Napoleon lived before or after the birth of Christ. Do you think that in the passages in Moses which forbid the Israelites to practice usury on their brethren, only the 7 or 10, or some percentage determined by Moses, is forbidden?

while you have never found in the law-book of the Jews, which is entirely in the hands of every Christian, any mention of a lawful rate of interest? Or that when the Israelites were permitted to usury the strangers, they were thereby told to exceed the rate of interest fixed by the government of the strangers for their lands?

The subject of our dispute is not usury in general, for, as is well known, there are many kinds of it, but usury of interest, or, more exactly, lending on usury. By this expression, then, a twofold action is designated; it is, 1st, a loan, i.e. the lender has the right to reclaim the thing borrowed, that is, here the capital or its equivalent (the exchange value), in all cases, even if it is lost through no fault of the borrower, while it is in the latter's possession. This right follows from the nature of lending; 2. Capital is entrusted to another for the purpose of making a profit with it; that is, the capitalist makes the other a servant, agent, or whatever one wants to call him, working for him with his capital, in that he conditions for himself a certain share in the profit to be made with this property of his by the other. - From this it follows that if I lend, that is, if I am entitled to restitution in any case, and I do this for nothing, this is not lending on usury; for there is no usury here. Further, if I lend my capital to another in order to derive profit from it, and thus stipulate that I shall have a share in the profit to be made with my property on the part of the other, and this capital of mine is lost in the hands of the other, and I regard this loss, as it affects my property in truth and in reality, as my loss also, this is likewise not lending on usury, for there is no lending here. It is self-evident that if a man squanders capital entrusted to him, he may justly be punished and compelled to make good out of his own property what has been thus squandered, or to replace it by labor. - Furthermore, if I hand over my capital to another for the sake of a profit to be made with it, I may also reclaim it, depending on the conditions agreed upon; for it is my property. Although this is often called a loan, it is not in reality a loan, since the latter entitles one in every case to the restitution or deposit of the equivalent in the event of loss, while in the latter case one has a right to reclaim one's own capital only if it is still available. - Furthermore, it follows from the above explanation that if I give my capital to another in order that he may also make a profit for me with it, that is, pay me interest; but it is lost through no fault of his, and I do not reclaim the lost capital merely because I cannot obtain it, but think that the man still owes me the same, my giving the capital to the other has been a loan on usury. - Further, if I have lost my share in the profit of my capital by the use of it on the part of the other man, I shall have lost my share in the profit of the other man.

If I make it a condition that, so long as this property of mine is used by the other and yields profit, something definite is paid to me at certain times, since I cannot control profit and loss in its use, or for other legal reasons, this is also not a loan on usury. In my opinion, it could only be regarded as an unfair contract if the regular percentages stipulated were so high that they could not be regarded as a fair compensation for the profit and loss arising from the use of the capital. - What has been said in all these cases about the loss of the whole capital applies, of course, in a corresponding way to a part of it.

Should you here ask the question: If each of the two acts of which usurious lending consists is a lawful one, why should they, united into one, be unlawful? Why should I not be allowed to lend my capital and at the same time to make a profit with it? then I would answer you with an example from another field, in which I may not presuppose any moral callousness, that is, something like the following. To hire a kitchen-maid and to take a wife are both lawful actions. But if I combine the two by one act in one person, I commit a shameful act. And if, according to my convenience and my own use, for weeks I treat my wife, whom I have married under this condition, only as a common kitchen maid, and then again at times as my wife, the disgracefulness of such conduct does not become an honorable way of acting because I have found a person who voluntarily offered herself for such treatment. Just as Scripture, by prohibiting the contempt and abuse of wives, seeks to maintain the sanctity of marriage among men, lest everything in this sphere should dissolve into licentiousness; so also, by prohibiting lending on usury, or the selfish mixture of contrary, conflicting contracts, the sanctity of honorable and lawful contracts; lest everything in trade and commerce should sink into selfishness and covetousness. But if anyone thinks that if he can only prove that enough people can be found who will voluntarily submit to both injustice and shamefulness because they know how to profit from them, then he has proved that these shamefulnesses are honorable, he is, to say the least, miserably mistaken.

That lending on usury - and by this, of course, I also mean the current lending of money permitted by the state, and lending on interests according to the explanation I have given above - has immoral, and therefore also harmful and pernicious, qualities can only be denied by those who have lost the ability in this matter to distinguish the moral from the immoral, the right from the wrong. Since so much has already been written on this subject, I shall only mention here one of these immoral

I would like to emphasize these characteristics, because they strike me in your writing. He who lends his capital on usury regards this capital in all but one case as his own property, for which reason he can not only reclaim it by contract, but is also entitled to a share in the profit which its use yields, or could yield, on the part of the other. Only in the one case in which this capital suffers damage does he no longer regard it as his own; in this case only the other's property, but not the capitalist's, has suffered damage, and the former is obliged, at least in his conscience, to deliver it up again just as if it had suffered no damage, or as if it had not been lost. To hold two opposite assertions, one of which must necessarily be false, as equally true and right, in order to derive advantage from both, is at any rate immoral and shameful. I will try to bring the matter closer to you by means of an example, and that from your point of view, according to which the usurer regards both assertions as true and correct. Someone has taken out a loan from a capitalist in the usual way and has paid the interest honestly for some years. Suddenly, through some misfortune, he loses everything he has and is left with nothing but his wife and child in the greatest misery. The capitalist, who, though well informed of the actual state of affairs, nevertheless holds the principle to be correct that the loss can and may affect only the other man's property, now swears before the authorities that through that misfortune only that man's property, but not his capital, has been lost, and since the latter will not surrender it to him, he demands their assistance. The authorities, trusting in the honesty and truthfulness of the capitalist, and in the opinion that the other man's property was still there and was only being maliciously withheld, thereupon sentenced the man as a villain to penal servitude in the penitentiary. - I ask, is the capitalist in that case not perjuring himself? Is not the assertion that any loss in this case affects only the other man's property an inversion of the actual facts? And is not a right founded on falsehood a wrong? - So also to you, where it is a question of the capitalist's profit, the capital in the hands of the other capitalist is property like a leased estate, or a rented house; and where you speak of the loss of this same capital, the other is the temporary owner of it, for which reason he alone must bear the loss. How, then, if the other were to employ the same sleight of hand, only in reverse, and were to regard himself or the capitalist as the owner, according as his own advantage required it? Even apart from the broken contract, you would declare that to be a joke.

Now I readily admit to you that in the attempt to justify the matter one could also take other paths; for what injustice could not be glossed over with apparent reasons? The thing itself, however, remains what it is, in spite of all palliation. The Jesuits with their mental

Reservations (secret reservations in oaths, contracts, etc.), which are to the eighth commandment what usurers are to the seventh, may boldly raise the question; Is it not lawful to testify, and also to withhold testimony? to make a promise, and not to make it? Certainly, will every honest man answer. But therein consists the very knavery, that you do both at the same time, and in the same matter; so that, while you seem to give the promise, you do not in truth give it, because of the condition attached to it by you in thought; or while you seem to speak your opinion, you do not in truth speak it, because of the intended ambiguity of your words; so that the advantage of both, of yes and no, may fall to you at the same time. - So also the usurer may ask, Is it not lawful for me to make a profit with my capital, and to lend it, and so, even if I lose it, to reclaim it from the debtor? Certainly, but therein consists the very knavery, that you do both at the same time and with the same capital; so that, while for the sake of profit you seem to surrender it to the vicissitudes of fortune, in truth you let it rest in the possession of others by mortgages, sureties, and the like, just as securely as if it did not come out of your box at all, so that the advantage of both, security and uncertainty at the same time, may accrue to you. The Christian, who is to do all things in Jesus' name, may ask himself in every honest business, How would the Lord do this business in my place? This he can do without violating the holiness of His divine person, since He entered into our earthly circumstances in the state of His humiliation. I now ask a Christian man whether he can conceive of the most holy as concluding a contract with his neighbor in which he declares: Since we both want to acquire something with my property, I claim for myself the security of my property and a certain profit in every case, however the transaction may proceed; you take over the possible profit, all the work, and all the damage, even if you would have to give up your own property to cover my claim. Such a savior would be no savior for me.

You yourself, against your will, have had to bear witness to the curse-worthiness of usury. You say: "We must not lose sight of the fact that in the old system, with the Jews, the creditor could throw the debtor into prison, even sell him as a serf, and that even in Luther's time, the debtor could be chased out of house and home, so that nothing remained for him but his bare life. Now, as is well known, this has changed so much, especially in this country, that the debtor must not only be left with the bare necessities, but in some regions the debtor can have the money in his pocket and laugh at the creditor. These old, oppressive laws were and are the reason why lending against interests, which is in itself indifferent, is in so many cases a poor man's only option.

and the inhabitants of whole regions destructive pressure." If, then, usury only ceases to destroy the poor, and indeed the inhabitants of whole regions, because the laws no longer protect the rights of the usurer as they used to do, they must themselves be a curse. They freely conclude very naively, therefore, usury is an innocent thing and only the laws bear the blame. So that is the reward the laws get from you for their protection of usury contracts. You seem to have no idea of the distress which this moral and social evil has caused the legislatures of the heathen and Christian states for thousands of years. How the monster has been dragged to and fro, sometimes this tooth has been broken out, sometimes that claw has been spanked, sometimes it has been squeezed, gagged, fanged, then released again to some extent, then bound again more tightly, watched over, plucked and squeezed. It never wanted to die. And now even the authorities here in this country, as you report in the passage cited, have abandoned it to the shame and maltreatment of the world in a way that would not be permitted even to the most shameful criminal; so that rogues have the property of the usurer in their pockets and may laugh at him with impunity, and the usurer is even cut off from the opportunity to be merciful. For if he wanted to give to the usurer the property to which he is entitled, as you think, by an honest contract, but which has been lost to both debtors, he would only laugh at him for such mercy, since he has no need of it. Now that the teeth of the monster, as it seems, are all broken out and the claws are all cut, so that it can no longer devastate and suck the land, as it used to do, it has suddenly become a new-milked cow for young and old. Now, my brothers, milk those who can milk! Here is the way opened to you for quick riches. Fear nothing, the beast bites not, it does no more harm. Hah! when the fat stream flows so abundantly into our buckets that one's heart laughs, what do we care if impractical theologians also stick their moral noses in and want to smell mischief? Does not charity shine upon us palpably in advantage and benefit? And to whom it thus shines in the eyes, he truly does not first ask what the thing is called in Hebrew. But if a childish conscience wants to make your heart tremble, then listen to how practical theologians, whom the progress of Christianity has cured of the pagan and ancient Christian abhorrence of such an innocent being, play to us so sweetly and powerfully, with flute and trombone and drum and timpani, that the heart is stirred up and strengthened to fresh activity! - Indeed, usury has become such a lovely, innocent creature to you, too, that you resent us quite seriously for not being able to fall in love with this moral beast. A bear is not a lamb, even if it is temporarily subdued and tied up, and the usurious interest imposed on the purchasers of the goods, as well as other immoral and harmful effects of the milk tapped from it, show that its nature has not yet become

...is ennobled with lamb's innocence and dove's simplicity... And who can guarantee us that his natural savagery will not, before we know it, come to a terrible head again? that the authorities will take their stand, regard the contract of usury as an honest and honorable one, and accordingly protect and defend the usurer's rights to his property with all the severity of the law, and that the latter, as once in Rome, will be permitted to have the solvent debtor led around the market on a chain, in order to induce compassionate souls to show pity and pay the lost capital for him? What song will the merry milkers raise then?

You will, however, demand that I go into your reasons for having taken a path in your justification of usury, by which one can justify with the same reasons and with the same skill - and with the same success - everything that the ten commandments forbid; this I have already indicated to you above by the example of the thief-Jnsulan in regard to stealing. I will therefore run over the particulars only briefly. - You first present those people who crowd around the capitalist and offer themselves to him voluntarily and without necessity as interest-bearing servants, not once, but again and again for years; and now, pointing to them, ask your opponents, with a sneer, whether we think them mad that they believed they had become poorer thereby, while they had saved thousands? I answer, no. These people use usury, first, because they know that the master to whom they pay interest has little power over them in this country, so that they can, if necessary, as you say, laugh at their creditor with the money in their pockets. Secondly, because they have not the slightest intention of paying the tribute due to the creditor out of their own assets, but, as already mentioned above, intend to take it from their customers, which pious intention I prefer to leave to your pen. But if you now ask me whether I am not convinced that usury is an act of charity by the circumstance that these people usually become rich in a short time, I answer, no.

You also point to honest people who are not speculators and who have benefited from the use of usury. I am sorry that, in order to communicate something new to your opponents, you have gone to so much trouble with so many laboriously worked out examples. We already knew that. I myself can draw your attention, and that of others, to a work in which, in addition to the harm, the benefits of moderate usury, kept within the limits of the law, are beautifully and clearly compiled. It is a work by the great English statesman Lord Bacon of Verulam, entitled *Essays*. In it he relates, among other things, that he knew a rich but hard man who lived in the country, who used to say: "Cursed be usury, for it prevents us from declaring mortgages and pledges forfeited.

The book will please you, but of course you must not expect to find your favorite idea, that usury is a fulfillment of the commandment of charity, in a work that has the spirit of a statesman like Baco for its author. After enumerating various judgments rejecting usury, he gives his own judgment in these words: "I say only this, that usury belongs to those things which are admitted for the sake of hardness of heart. For since the lending and borrowing of money is necessary among men, and they are so hard of heart that they will not lend it for nothing, nothing remains but that usury should be allowed!" - On the other hand, they seem to be thoroughly animated by the conviction that a contract, however unjust it may be, if it only improves and increases the neighbor's goods and food, fulfills the commandment of charity. If, for example, someone wants to use a loan he has received "for great profit a few days longer than stipulated, and to pay the interest charged him excessively high by the crafty creditor for the short delay, in your opinion the usurious creditor has done a deed of love; for by lending so advantageously to himself he has at the same time increased and improved his neighbor's goods. Thank God that He has not called you to be a public interpreter of His holy law; if you wanted to preach such love, you would poison the souls entrusted to you with the publican's and sinner's morality to eternal death, and burden yourself with a terrible responsibility. Another kind of reasoning which you have attempted, I may briefly sum up thus: usury is equivalent to the hiring of labourers; but as it is not such a hiring, it is equivalent to the hiring of a house; but as it is not such a hiring, it is equivalent to the hiring of a beast; but as it is not such a hiring, it is equivalent to the hiring of a field; But since it is not the renting of a field, it is equivalent to buying and selling; but since it is not either, it is equivalent to borrowing; but that "the word borrow expresses the fact obscurely, I cannot help, I have to do not with words, but with facts." So he is all things at once, and therefore, of course, none. But people of good sense do not trust a fellow if he merely wants to be everybody's cousin and, as soon as he appears among honest people, assumes one *alias* after another.

If you say that the capitalist should not let his borrowing fellow-Christian bear the sole loss, and likewise not, conversely, the borrower the lender, I only remark that the capitalist should practice this not only on the fellow-Christian, but on the fellow-man, and since this should be a divine commandment, he should also not conclude any contract whose provisions contradict this divine commandment. What you say here about the debtor's duty is, of course, not disputed, and it extends to the debtor's duty.

likewise not only to the Christian, but to the neighbor. We have no stranger on whom we may run riot.

Your remarks on the barrenness of money show that the object was too high for you; for you confound money with what is exchanged for it, which, in so far as it is also exposed to diminution and damage, the capitalist does not regard as his own property; and if he has to accept it in place of his capital, he regards it so little as a representation of it that he demands a subsidy from the rest of the debtor's property, if it is of less value than his capital.

These are all the reasons with which you think you have justified usury. However, you also use some other means, which I must touch on briefly in conclusion. Your opponents maintain that it is not wrong to pay usurious interest if one is in great need of a loan and can obtain it only on this condition. About this you give us a terrible speech of punishment for being guilty of supposed mortal sins and the like. Since I cannot imagine that you would rather starve than borrow money at interest from one whom you also consider to be a shameful usurer, I think you have added this sermon to your other reasons only in the sense in which wild peoples, when attacking the enemy, raise a terrible cry which they themselves know to be quite harmless, but which is nevertheless supposed to frighten the enemy so that he begs for mercy with a trembling heart and shaking knees or takes flight. Well, this may have its reason in incorrect ideas of us people who live behind the mountains so much closer to the sunset. The following is a somewhat different matter. You tell your readers that our edifice, that is, the doctrine of the divine word that lending on usury is sinful, rests on soap bubbles, and has now collapsed by your crushing them. These bubbles, which are supposed to form the foundation of our doctrine, are, as you say, our presupposition, that the capitalist in all cases recovers his capital, and in all cases has a sure profit in the interest. That the capitalist, when he lends his money, seeks to secure his capital by mortgages, sureties, and the like, you keep like a deep, ghastly secret with such fidelity that not even the slightest hint of it has escaped you in your whole writing. But since you know only to speak, with almost touching innocence, of the extraordinary kindness and goodness with which the capitalists give their capital to poor young peasants and journeymen craftsmen, which you have had the pleasure of experiencing in the relatively small circle of your acquaintance in thousands and thousands of examples, one would indeed almost envy you your paradisiacal surroundings, resplendent in the most beautiful virtues of the golden age. But now, in order to be able to burden your opponents with the above nonsensical premise, that soap-bubble foundation,

82 Letter to the author of the paper: "Das Ausleihe des Geldes etc." ("The lending of money etc.").

cite passages from our writings which state the very opposite; e. g., "that this security often fails through banker's leases, etc., goes without saying; I speak only of the security as it is possible on earth, and as the lender intends to procure it." Your opponents, then, condemn the intention of the capitalist, even in the event that it fails, but not a fictitious fact that this intention would never be frustrated. If you had eliminated this intention, which is not a soap bubble, but a very hard fact, then you could justly triumph; but, for your own sake, you should not let the opinion be voiced that, if you fabricate soap bubbles and then crush them again, you are breaking other people's houses with them.- The following is even worse. You quote a proposition from the theses of your opponents, which says that if the creditor accepts a gift made to him out of gratitude, this is not usury. On the basis of this proposition you introduce an example prepared for your purpose with the following words: "Now I want to illuminate in practical execution your theory of 'lending money without fixed contract, and expecting gifts of profit instead of interest.'" That your opponents heartily abhor such a theory, which you even call ours, as expressed by us, with quotation marks, namely, a lending in which gifts are expected, you must have known. In the same theses from which you took that sentence, you must also have read, among other things, the sentence: "Even Cicero writes: "Even Cicero writes: 'If you lend to someone for your own sake, it is not to be considered a work of charity, but usury.'" If you proceed in such a way with the demands of the eighth commandment, is it any wonder that an act which the well-mannered heathen recognized as wrong should be ridiculed by you only because your borrowed capital would not yield regular and sure interest in the process?

Regarding the Nothwucher, you do not expect any explanation from me. Whoever has read what Luther wrote about it in his unsurpassable way and knows nothing else to do than to whistle at the high spirit of this man with a joke about the thieving cobbler, for him I have nothing to say about the subject.

And with that, I lay down my rusty pen. I took it up, not to wage a feather war, but in consequence of urgent summons. Do not expect a reply to any replica; it would hardly be made. If, in the just judgment of those who have read all we have written on the subject, and compared it with your writing, I have done wrong, I must bear it. Nothing was done intentionally.

It draws with all due respect yourR . Lange.

Litterary Intelligences.

True Christianity etc. by John Arndt. A new and complete American edition. Lutheran Book Store, No. 807 Vine st., Philadelphia, Pa. ($4.00.)

Arndt's True Christianity was already translated into English in 1712 by A. W. Böhm, court preacher at St. James. Last year, Charles F. Schäffer, Professor at Philadelphia, published a new edition of it. It is well furnished and by ej,nem life Jo. Arndt, as well as accompanied by a subject index. Admittedly, it contains only the first four books. Should a new reprint be necessary, we ask to change the number 1557 on page 14, line 27.

The Lutheran doctrine of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. By Bev. IL E. Jacobs, A. M. Gettysburg: J. E. Wible, Printer, North-East Corner of the Diamond. 1869. 8.

This is a bill presented to the Pittsburg Synod, Oct. 1. J., and published by order of the same in the Ev. Quar. Review and now published as a pamphlet. It first proves the pure doctrine of Sunday with passages from the Confessions and from the writings of the teachers of our church, points out the deviations of which some otherwise orthodox theologians have been guilty on this point, also lists several famous theologians of non-Lutheran communions as truth witnesses for this doctrine, and concludes with the exegetical proof of the teaching of our church on this point. Every righteous Lutheran will heartily thank and bless the honorable author for having had the courage to give this glorious testimony to biblical and Lutheran truth in such a well-founded manner. W.

Miscellencies.

Facts against materialism.

Under this heading the "Luth. Herold" of February 1 contains the following excellent article:

The notorious Karl Vogt famously made the statement: "The soul is a product of the development of the brain ... only a collective name for the various functions that belong exclusively to the brain. All thinking, willing, and doing of man is nothing else than the result of the respective nourishment and conversion of the brain substance."

In contrast to this I find the following interesting facts:

1. "One has often seen no change in the moral and intellectual qualities of human beings where the removal of destroyed hemispheres (of the brain) was necessary. In some cases one has even found constant destruction in one hemisphere without disturbance of the mind, and Cruvil here has reported the case of atrophy of the entire left hemisphere of the large brain in a 42-year-old man with undisturbed mental faculty." Joh. Müller, Physiology, I., 836.

2. "Significant destructions, changes of form, suppurations may take place without the functions of sensibility immediately ceasing. The frequent examples which prove this are astonishing. I have seen three cases where a bullet had penetrated the frontal bone and destroyed a whole hemisphere without the patient in the least losing his senses; still more striking was an example which occurred in 1827 at the Royal Charité in Berlin. A man, out of annoyance at his wife, had put a pistol straight between both eyes. . .. He had completely destroyed the entire frontal bone, both eyes and the front part of both hemispheres. Thousands of bone splinters were stuck in the brain. But he was breathing... . The doctor asked sullenly: To the not inconsiderable astonishment of all present, the most dreadfully wounded man answered: "Let me die, the sooner the better. "* Then his wife came sobbing to the bed; when he heard her, he said: "Your work, madam," and he died twelve hours later. - I could cite many similar cases." Neumann, p. 88. Unfortunately, the work is not specified, perhaps H. Neumann, Lehrbuch der Psychiatrie.

3. "A young man shot himself two bullets in the head, lost at once a pair of cups of brain-subsistence, besides the considerable suppuration which later set in, and yet remained alive. He had become blind, but, by the way, was in better condition than ever; he had formerly been gloomy, little communicative, and of a ponderous mind, and after recovery showed himself not only more cheerful and talkative, but also more intelligent. Volkmann according to Froriep's Notizen aus dem Gebiet der Natur- und Heilkunde, 1836, p. 334.

4. "In the year 1817 a boy died, who from his 8th month of life until his 10th or death year suffered from multiple syphilitic ills inherited from his parents. From his 8th year on, in spite of all the remedies used against him, his organism began to disintegrate more and more, accompanied by paralysis of all his limbs. Yes, he even lost all his senses, smell, taste, sight and touch. Only his hearing remained, and speech and mental power. One day before his death, on Char Friday, his sister rebuked him. She said to him that she wanted to go to mass, and he answered: "Rather, say that I am going to the office, since there is no mass today. When he died the next day, after a violent attack of headache, he was immediately told that he was going to mass.

the skull opened, and the physician found no brain in the same; only on the bottom of the skull was a little bloody fluid above the *sensorium commune.*" W. Wenzel, according to Hufeland's praktisches Journal der Heilkunde. October, 1823.

If Mr. Karl Vogt could only be employed for half a year as a teacher at an idiotic institution and if love could be instilled in him to really devote himself to this profession, he would be infallibly cured of his theories that the soul is nothing different from its brain organ. (?) *) Nowhere is the opposite truth more evident than in the case of these wretches, where the soul struggles with the most visible effort through the derangement of its deformed organ.

We were pleased to read in the "*Evangelical Lutheran*" of February 11 the following faithful recognition and high esteem of our Reformation fathers and their writings: "The present state of affairs of life contains much that tempts and misleads men to underestimate the learning and literary merits of earlier generations. Our symbolical books and the writings of our excellent theologians of earlier times are a deep and inexhaustible shaft of theological ore, which not only enriches our dogmatic and ethical knowledge, but also shows us how to penetrate more deeply into the right understanding of Scripture. Luther and the older theologians of our church owe this special advantage by no means to the progress of their time or to the exceptional spirit of the men who brought their time into renown, but to the inner life that flamed more fervently in them than in their descendants. Moreover, in addition to this participation in the divine life, they possessed a beautiful fund of scientific education, perfectly adequate for their circumstances. Let us then descend into the shaft they dug. Let us go deeper and deeper. Look up! Behold, the heavens do not, as on the surface with our prejudiced contemporaries, reflect the faint colors of refracted light, but glow with the majestic watch-fires of eternity, and below we see the lamps of the miners shining brightly and merrily, like flames kindled by God, eternally maintained by the Almighty. Who can duly appreciate the riches brought to light by the untiring labors of these faithful men? Our wonder at the great treasures of our ecclesiastical literature is matched only by amazement at the rapid change that has taken place with so many of our contemporaries. People who went to sleep at night with the most unmeasured opposition to the faith

*) Hardly, since Vogt undoubtedly did not become incredulous by the results of his researches, but was led in his researches by his incredulity and arrived at his alleged results. L. u. W.

of the Church, rose up the other morning overflowing with unbounded admiration of the inheritance which has come down to us from our fathers. Do you not think that on the surface there is too much ado about nothing? To find out the whole merit and character of our Church is not to be done in a day. Let us hope, however, that the success of this theological change will be a lasting one, and that our Lutheranizing brethren will do full justice not only to the dogmatic but also to the ethical part of our confession, both by doctrine and example. Our time is admittedly a practical one. The progress of which we boast facilitates intercourse among men, but whether it is also favorable to closer intercourse with God may be questionable. Our opening of new sources of help, though a material blessing, yet brings neither new powers of understanding, nor new consolations to the heart, nor new strength to the purity of life. Our enlightenment has brought no brighter light on the character of God, nor does it explain the mysteries of the human soul. Our knowledge and progress is not directed to the ten commandments, but seeks to establish a higher law than the revealed will of God. The blessings we enjoy do not impel the restless soul to soar on eagle's wings to the cloudless heights of pure light, but cloud the eye through the mists of pantheism and materialism. On the other hand, our time is distinguished by many a strange discovery and invention. But this concession does not justify laying aside our confession as worthless, condemning it without prior patient examination and impartial judgment, and saying that we are the fathers, our ancestors the children, or, in other words, that the theologians of today stand higher than the fathers of our church. Have we then anything that they did not possess? They had the same text of Scripture which we accept as genuine. All the discoveries, improvements, and alterations of Griesbach, Tischendorf, Lachmann, &c., all our discoveries and inventions, do not change a single doctrine contained in our symbols. You who now take the credit of opposing their errors, what support does our time offer your undigested opinions? Not all contemporaries of great and astonishing events deserve in the same degree the honor and prestige of talented men. Art thou, adversary of our symbols, the inventor of steam-engines and the telegraph, for instance? Hast thou calculated the distance and course of the stars? Did thy hand perform the wonderful building of the palace for the World's Fair? Hast thou drawn the plans of the battles of Washington, Bonaparte, and Mollke? Did you preside in the council of Jefferson Davis, of Louis Napoleon, of Bismark? What hast thou done to show the strength and infallibility of thy mind? Where is your authority to criticize the fathers? Do you rely, in the struggle against our ecclesiastical litterature, on arguments which have been put forward by the opposing-

If you do not take into account the present state of things, you will not escape defeat. Let the characters who have glorified themselves by their genius stand up, let them judge in your stead, for you cannot claim a decisive voice in this question. Suppose they decide in your favor, is that proof that your opinion is correct? Nevermore! For would you thus conclude: The doctrines of the fathers of the Lutheran Church are false, because emperors, kings, generals, merchants, inventors, discoverers, etc. have declared themselves against them: you have been deceived by the fallacy that distinction and authority on one side and in one relation of life in the same individual are necessarily and uniformly accompanied by distinction and authority on every side and in every relation; in other words, that a man who has acquired the skill and ability of a good shoemaker or tailor possesses equally and in virtue thereof the talent and ability of a great general, doctor, or jurist; or that a man who is well at home in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew is in consequence also a good connoisseur of the Russian and Chinese languages, and a competent critic of the literature in question. Doubtless you see that your argument, which is taken from the progress in some branches of science, is quite inconclusive, for we require competent witnesses and judges. And as to the newer theologians, some of whom choose to be their guides instead of our reliable fathers, the discerning and unprejudiced seeker after truth will easily perceive that all the difficulties and objections of the newer critics are but repetitions of what has long since been advanced by the opponents of the Reformers, and has already been perfectly explained and placed in the light of truth. If age does not harm the speeches of our opponents, why should we not confidently expect the same from the defense of our friends? Therefore do not think lightly of the literary legacy of the fathers of our Church!"

---------- ----------

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

Immersion. To the question, "Are there any circumstances under which a Lutheran preacher should baptize by immersion?" the "***Lutheran and Visitor***" of Columbia, S. C., Jan. 20, answers very well, among other things, this: "No! With immersion in America is always connected the rejection of infant baptism. It is therefore very probable that this mode of performing the appointed act would bring into the church a class of persons opposed to the doctrines of the church. Do not pay homage to a false spirit of accommodation in order to get members who are not sound in doctrine, nor can be! How are we to ward off Anabaptism, if we baptize both with sprinkling and immersion? " W.

Calvin's doctrine of usury. The papers of other churches are now also beginning to turn their attention to the doctrine of usury. The local "Reformirte Kirchenzeitung" also belongs to these papers. In its number of February 11 it announces

u. Among other things, a letter of Calvin's on the "interest weaving", as she correctly translates "***usura***". In this letter Calvin sets seven conditions under which alone he declares the charging of interest or usury to be unacceptable. A very important, decisive condition is the fourth, which the Ref. Kz. renders as follows: "He who borrows money may, by labor or activity, earn as much or more with the money as he who lends it." This translation alters the sense of Calvin's words entirely. The wording, according to the original text handed down by Veza, is as follows: "***Ut, qui mutuo accipit, lucretur tantundem aut plus etiam ex ea pecunia, quam qui illi mutuo dat, sive industriam sive operam conferat***." This sentence is connected with the introductory words, "Finally, I hold that interest on money can only ever be lawfully taken under these restrictions, and not besides;" whereupon the fourth of these restrictions, after the words quoted, thus reads, "That he who borrows money earns as much or more with the money as he who lends to it, by industry or labor." Calvin thus rejects the claiming and taking of interest or usury, unless the debtor gains as much or even more with the borrowed money than the creditor; if the former fails to invest the loan made, then, according to Calvin, the creditor is also deprived of interest and usury. It is true that even this restriction is not sufficient to make the contract really a legal contract based on equality; it is also necessary for the creditor to share the risk of the capital if he wants to share in the profit, in the increase; the restriction that Calvin makes alone condemns usury, as it is now practiced almost universally even by otherwise conscientious Christians. It is evidently wrong to have Calvin make the meaningless remark under No. 4, that the debtor may earn as much or more with the money as he lends it. W.

A voice in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" about free conferences. To our delight, we read in the February 11 issue of the aforementioned paper: "If it were possible, I should be glad if a free conference could be held for the purpose of a thorough, free and fraternal discussion of the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church and the points that still divide us. At this conference I wish to see as many as can be gathered together, especially the leaders among the theologians of the ***Church Council***, the General Synod, the Missouri and Ohio Synods, and our brethren in the South. Meetings in the journals are good enough as far as they go; but after all, we believe that nothing can equal bringing people together face to face for a frank, serious discussion, where every objection can be met immediately, every misunderstanding can be remedied promptly. In this way, I believe, many difficulties could be cleared out of the way, and many people would get to know each other better. Such a conference should have no legislative authority and should not impose anything as binding, but should be a free peace conference for the purpose of facilitating a better understanding of the points at issue and among each other. I would that, as long as it seemed necessary, such a conference should be held every year, and that all the disputes now being carried on in our journals and in our pulpits should be transferred to it. Some of us would gladly go to the trouble and expense of listening to such a conference and witnessing a dialectical and theological duel between Dr. Sihler and Dr. G. A. Brown, Dr. C. P. Krauth and Dr. Sprecher, and so on. If we could only induce the eminent men of all parties in the church to attend such a free conference, our people would certainly rejoice in it, and would not only witness such a battle of wits, but would learn more from a good stenographic report of such a conference than from all the journal strife in the world. As Brother Brobst has always been a great friend to Conferences, I almost think I see him throwing his hat in the air at this proposal, if otherwise a brother of his years and venerable character could be guilty of such a precipitate outburst." C.

Good Counsel of the "*American Lutheran*" to the *Church Council*. With a sweetly beckoning siren voice, the said paper, in its number of Feb. 4, thus states: "The position taken by our dear brethren of the ***General Council,*** and the answer given them by the Missouri brethren, should convince them that they can co-operate far more kindly and amicably with the General Synod than with the brethren of Missouri, Ohio, and New York. We shall all yet meet again, and, weary of strife, sigh, wrestle, and cry for peace. " C.

The General Synod and the Germans. In reply to an accusation in Brobst's "Magazine" that the General Synod had formerly neglected the German and the Germans, the same number of the "***American Lutheran***" breaks out into the following counter-accusations and complaints: "Is it not strange that our German brethren, who continually accuse us that we of the General Synod are not orthodox and do not deserve the name Lutheran, at the same time reproach us that we do not train German preachers for their congregations? What strange contradictions!" - Does the "Zeitschrift" feel struck? "But we maintain that the General Synod has by no means neglected its interest in the Germans, as it is falsely blamed. At its institutions at Gettysburg, Springfield, and Selinsgrove, care has always been taken for the study of the German language, and its Society for Inner Mission has supported as many, if not more, German as English missionaries; but its Society for the Propagation of the Church has lent the greater part of its capital to German congregations. The experience we have had, however, has been sad and discouraging. The German preachers who were trained by the General Synod have almost all turned against them and are among their loudest "taunters"; the German missionaries have left us as soon as they no longer needed our help, and the congregations which were supported with money by the Society for the Propagation of the Church have mostly gone over to the ***General Council*** or to the Missourians. A large portion of such money has been loaned to congregations of the Wisconsin and Texas Synods. Both Synods have joined the ***General Council***, but in most cases never a cent has been paid either by capital or interest, and thousands of thalers will thus be entirely lost to society. Would it not be well done by these symbolist brethren, who accuse us of dishonor for bearing the Lutheran name, to which they think we have no claim, if they drew the beam out of their own eye, and paid their debts honestly, before they attempt to draw the mote out of their brother's eye?" Indeed. "Had this money, thus given to the Germans, been used for our English missions in the West, the success would now be very different. We would think that such congregations as have become independent and rich, and do not repay the money lent, should be required by law to do so, and that this money should then be used to support scanty congregations in the General Synod. But I do not speak of neglecting the German interest. Where there is well-founded hope that our German brethren will remain faithful to the principles of the General Synod, we should encourage and support them." - C.

The *Observer* on the Union of the Lutheran Church. This is the favorite topic of this arch-Lutheran paper, which calls itself Lutheran and wants to be Lutheran. As always, it also deals with the same subject in the number of January 22, thus: "In our opinion, no person born and educated in America and speaking the English language can believe what Missouri teaches as true Lutheranism; much less can individual English congregations be founded on it and entire American synods be united on it. No preacher of the General Synod could conscientiously accept it, the majority of the ***General Council*** feels impelled to reject it, and none of the Synods, which are still remote from both, dare go there. Even on the basis of the ***General Council,*** the Lutheran Church here cannot agree, neither according to the simple wording of the same, for in this they are not one whit behind the basis of Missouri, nor according to the modified interpretation, which they have in action.

The General Synod could not accept them because of their absolutely confessional demands, which are declared to be unchangeable, for this makes them a rope of tow that is likely to be torn by the little finger of circumstance, a waxen nose that models itself after the pressure of ecclesiastical needs. (The eyes of the enemy see keenly!) "The General - Synod could not accept them because of their absolutely confessional demands, which, moreover, are declared immutable. The Missourians cannot accept it because of the unionistic and inconsistent interpretation given to it. The Synods still single, however, are likely to range themselves still less around the same. Those of an extreme symbolical tendency will cross over to the Missouri side, those of an American tendency to the GeneralSynod side. So only on the basis of General - Synod, if on any, can the Lutheran Church unite. Not on this basis, as it is distorted by its open enemies, nor as it is perverted and misinterpreted by some of its outspoken friends, but on this basis in the sense given by the words in which it expresses itself, in which it was originally adopted, which has its interpretation in its official acts, and which is reflected in the earlier history of the Lutheran Church of Europe. On this basis there are now twenty-two Synods, and formerly eight of the present Synods of the ***General Council,*** and five of the Southern General Synod. On this basis the local Lutheran Church was organized, on it it fought against Rome and won (?), on it it united and continually made new doctrinal and spiritual conquests. And since it encompasses what the general consensus of the Lutheran Church in the 7th article of the Augsburg Confession calls the true unity of the Church. Confession declared necessary for the true unity of the church, every pastor, every member, every congregation, every synod belonging to the Lutheran church in its catholicity could stand on the same. If this basis were properly defined and honestly adhered to, the whole fragmented household of the Lutheran Church in America could dwell together in brotherly harmony, and by thus showing, through harmonious cooperation, how good it is when "brethren are of one accord," it could also unite and bring together again the disunited Lutheran elements of Europe. Thus, strengthened and invigorated, he could become the leader in the great work of gathering the whole Church of the Saviour into one flock under the One Shepherd, the Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honor and glory forever and ever.** Thus, spiritual barkers praise themselves and their goods with great, sweet words. Meanwhile the truth beareth witness, and beareth witness, and beareth witness, and they that are of the truth fall unto it. -C.

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States, according to the new Almanac for 1869, now numbers 3394 priests, 146 more than last year, not including the latest ordinations of several dioceses. They are to raise $250,000 for the Collegium of "Propaganda" in Rome, and intend to increase this sum to $500,000. (Rcf. Kz.)

Marginal notes of the "*Lutheran and Visitor*" to the number of the *"American Lutheran" of* Dec. 24 of last year about the disgraceful advertising in church magazines. That in this country even the ordinary church periodicals open their columns to the most colorful, often meaningless, often frivolous, often even fraudulent and disgraceful advertisements for the sake of advertising fees, is unfortunately well known and only too well deserves the rebuke which the "***Lutheran and Visitor***" in its number of February 3 issues to the "***American Lutheran***". He has before him the above number of that paper, and reports from it, as follows: "On page 4, the Rev. J. N. Sikes' sermon on dancing is highly recommended to keep the young people out of the ballrooms. On the same page a 'Pianist's Matinée' is indicated and equally recommended by the obliging editor. It contains 26 quadrilles with instructions. So here we have Sikes warning the young folk against dancing, and Elias Howe giving them quadrilles with instructions to teach them to dance, with the complaisant Peter resembling the man who made off when the bear was upon his wife, and calmly watching from afar said he did not care who got the blows. To judge by his indifferent countenance...

we can almost hear him saying: "Go on, as you can. - On another page, which contains a very learned three-way conversation between Peter, Jakob and Johann, two of the employees of the paper undertake to abstain from tobacco for a year". In two other places, too, the matter of tobacco is touched upon, and the editor alludes to its evil effects. On page 3 we then find -An Antidote to Tobacco' indicated, the wonderful effects of which are extolled even by preachers. If, then, tobacco is as harmful as the editor claims, and this advertisement tells the truth, it seems to me that Peter could not spend his life more profitably than by selling that antidote. - An editorial bears the inscription, 'Found at last!' A remedy which not only affords relief in consumption, but cures it. The remedy is: Dr. Witsar's Balsam of the Wild Cherry. Now this is not a mere advertisement, but an editorial essay, for the truth of which the editor must vouch. Now the question is simple: Does the editor believe what is said in it to be true? If not, he lends his columns to fraud. But if he believes it to be true, is he capable of being an editor? - Next follows a whole mass of advertisements by 'hair-renewers', none of whom he himself has any confidence in. So he has agencies like any other secular paper that carry the month's P100. And the greatest pity is not that he publishes such humbug, but that he nevertheless calls his paper a religious paper for the good of the church. - In a corner of this sheet of his, just to fill up the space, he says: -He who holds the sack is as bad as the thief.' If Peter should again need a line or two to fill, I would commend to him the sentence, 'He that publishes humbug in a religious journal is no better than he that makes it.' - But to crown the matter, we find in this religious (?) sheet, printed large and in an eye-catching place, the following: 'Agents coveted for the secrets of the great city.' Then the editor tells his readers what this wonderful book is about, namely, the vices and crimes of New York. The reader, he says, is led through the gambling dens, dance halls, racketeers' bars, lotteries, and many a place of vice, and while he wades through the fetid pool of shame and shamelessness, the secrets and crimes of New York are illustrated to him in thirty steel engravings. Such a book is indicated in a paper, addressing the support of the Christian Church, by a man who calls himself a Christian, and holds the sacred office of a Christian preacher. It is immediately followed by: M. H. Smith's new book, Sunshine and Shade in New YorK. This, he says, contains 720 finely illustrated pages, describing the disgusting scenes in the dens of shame and vice. Thousands of young people there are in the country, and among them many readers of this excellent religious (?) paper, who are as wholly unacquainted with the low and hideous dens of vice in New York as with the interior of Africa. Happy ignorance.' But this Christian editor leads them from street to street, shows them the most outrageous deeds of infamy, although he thinks them youths and maidens of a pure heart, and then prates and whines in his essays about the depravity and immorality of the times, and about the rampancy of vice. - There may be one excuse for him: that the subscriptions are not sufficient to maintain the paper, so he must advertise whatever is paid for. Now, we have seen a church in Boston, in the under room of which was a grocerie shop. A Christian gentleman, to whom we "expressed our astonishment" at this impropriety of the Word of God being preached upstairs and rum being sold downstairs, said, "You don't understand. The church was built on speculation. Now speculation goes a long way, but you simple, honest Lutherans who hold to the old symbolic idea that doctrine and practice must go hand in hand, and are convinced that it is unchristian to do evil that good may come of it, you do not understand this. You are behind the times. " C.

The *Lutheran Standard* on the Communion Platform of the *General Council*. This is what the said paper says in its number of Feb. 15: "It cannot be denied that the propositions adopted by the ***General Council*** on the 'four points' have been understood in a different sense. This cannot be denied even by those who deny that the opinion was expressed ambiguously. We see, therefore, no reason why those who refer to this fact, and wish it to be otherwise, should be called and treated as enemies by those who work in and for the ***General Council.*** Prof. Fritschel, in the Iowa Gazette of Jan. 15, attributes the difference between the Council and those who urge a practice consistent with the Lutheran confession, and who are still separated from the ***Council,*** simply to the fact that, while the former considers nothing more necessary for the admission of non-Lutherans to the Lord's Supper than a confession of the Lutheran faith before the pastor, the stricter Lutherans demand a public confession, and so an open conversion to the Lutheran Church. We admire the skill with which Prof. Fritschel usually dissects the thoughts and accurately grasps the point in dispute; but we cannot refrain from calling attention in the present case to the fact that he has overlooked a point which is essential to the proper interpretation of the language used by the ***Council.*** It would, of course, be right to understand the words just as they are spoken, without looking to the circumstances which explain their meaning; but when venerable men have spoken unequivocally on a point, it is not fine to interpret their words afterwards in such a way as to come into conflict with their former declarations, if, indeed, they admit of a meaning compatible with the latter. If the matter stood as Prof. F. represents it, we should be glad, but we cannot see it. We cannot, in view of the declarations of various members of that body, regard it as the opinion of the majority of them that an oral confession of the Lutheran faith was required as a condition of Communion. It has been asserted by eminent men of the Council that no member of any other denomination, who, after the Lutheran doctrine has been clearly presented to him, desires to come to the altar, should be turned away. No proof should be required that one accepts the Lutheran doctrine, except that which lies in the simple fact that one is willing to receive the Lord's Supper in the Lutheran church". In these times of unionist indifference, however, such proof weighs as much as nothing, since now some in their heated zeal are willing to communicate anywhere, if only an opportunity is offered them to show their bishops' love." The ***Council's*** position seems to us to be, not that every communicant must give assurance that he accepts the Lutheran doctrine, but that there is no compelling evidence that he rejects it. The Council probably has another step to take before it stands where Prof. F. would like to place it. Nothing is gained by presenting things differently than they really are. The Council is not what a healthy Lutheran body ought to be, and whether, because we say so, we are regarded as friends or enemies, that is not the point. If the Council is to become a power in this country, it can surely do so only by going the honest way of currency; those who cannot stand that will go behind and gradually get away from it altogether. " C.

II. foreign countries.

The "Freimund," in the last number of its former volume, closes the quarterly report with the verse: "In this grievous afflicted time, grant us, HErr, constancy," etc.; why does it not retain the original LeSart of the old incomparable Lutheran hymn: "In this last afflicted time," etc.? Is it that the last time has not yet come to the chiliastes?! W.

Hanover. In the Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt No. 46 of this year, a voice from Hanover was heard saying: "The church regiment stepped forward with the unfortunate dogma

of the hospitable admission of Unirterians to Holy Communion. We have warned more than once in this paper against the dogma. It was in vain, we remained in the minority among the clergy of our regional church; the organ of the majority and of the regional consistory, the Wochenschau of the Hannoverische Landeszeitung, accused us of rigorism and afterwards set out to silence us to death. A breach has been made in our fortress by the dogma of hospitable admission. The enemy is tenacious; he penetrates through the breach and begins to establish himself undisturbed."

Paris. A German writer once called Paris "the devil's kitchen." What dishes have already come over to us from there! I (the co-signed Pastor Friede, v. Bodelschwingh, who worked for years in Paris as a pastor) call Paris the unfortunate city, which no place in the world equals in soul-destroying influences and in manifold powers of seduction! - And there thousands upon thousands of Germans flock. Already in 1862 their number was estimated at 60-80,000 souls. Artistic interest, profit-seeking, recklessness and wantonness, poverty and hardship draw them to the dangerous crater. "To make money, to make money at any price, not only to get rich, but to enjoy, to enjoy at any price, that is the ruling spirit in Paris." Money is the idol around which everything dances. To say to someone: ***Il n'est pas*** heureux (he is not happy), almost always means: he has no money! "What a worker recently said to one of my friends, when he began to talk to him about God, - he laughingly pulled his wallet out of his pocket and said ***Voila, quand il y a la de l'argent, c'est Dieu, quand il n'y en a pas, c'est le diable*** (Come now! if there is money in here, it is God, but if there is nothing, it is the devil) - that is the correct expression of Parisian popular religion." - Under such circumstances one should not be surprised that there are 2,500-3000 foundlings in Paris every year! And yet, as I have said, so many thousands of Germans, waiters, tradesmen, maids, and especially such people as are driven from their German homes by want and misery, flock to the open gullet and magic circle every year. Here it is especially the mountainous part of Rhenania and Hesse, as well as the countries bordering France, Rhenish Prussia, Baden, and Würtemberg, which have to look for their poorest emigrants, who were not able to move to America, on the streets of Paris. All these would wither spiritually and perish if they were not taken care of in Christian, caring love, if their spiritual needs were not provided for. For this reason the Evangelical Mission among the Germans in Paris came into being. There is much to be done, but also much help and support from the German fatherland is needed. God has already bestowed His rich blessing on the work. German congregations have come into being, and in larger numbers, they are flourishing. Thus: the "hill" in the Villette - church and school in ***Batig. nolles*** - the German branch of ***Saint-Marcel*** (German church, schools, infant school, etc.) - the German community of the Redemption.) - the German congregation of the ***Redemption*** - the congregation and church of ***the Billet (in*** which I preached in 1862) - the German Young Men's Association and the hostel "zur Heimath" - the institutions in the ***Faubourg Saint-Antoine*** and the ***Faubourgs du Temple and Saint Martin*** - in the Faubourg ***Saint-Germain - the*** chapel of ***Bon-Secours*** - the institutions of ***Charonne and*** so on. Now there is a plan to found a "theological preparatory school" which needs 22,000 francs a year for its maintenance.

(From a public petition for the Lutheran Church in Parks.)

The Lutheran Association. Under this name, an association has formed in Dresden, which seeks to spread the knowledge of the pure doctrine of our church among the people, especially through genuine Lutheran tracts. The Lutheran Association, united in the unconditional recognition of the entire doctrinal content of the symbols of the Lutheran Church, accepts the right given to every Christian in God's Word to examine and judge doctrine, and also to be a member of the Lutheran Church.

He claims this right for himself and seeks to fulfill the duty corresponding to this right. In this way, he publicly testifies against false doctrine and practice that contradict the confession of the church. His first paper, in which it is explained why the Lutherans cling so firmly to the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, has already been followed by a second one under the title *): "Chiliasm is False," by Father Fick, in which all old and new chiliastic raptures, taught here and there in universities and preached from pulpits, with their appendage, the conversion of Israel as a people before the end, are refuted from God's Word. We have followed this writing with a third under the title, ""Why no Lutheran, for the salvation of his soul, may join an Unirte Church."" - Price 2 Ngr. It is true that the Lutheran Association has been reproached for fighting exclusively or preferably against the error of chiliasm, but this is not so; on the contrary, the Lutheran Association intends to bear witness both to the fact that the Pope is the Antichrist and that Freemasonry is a work of darkness, and it intends to bear witness against the false Union, which in its principles comes from the father of lies, as against the unionist sympathies manifesting themselves under the Lutheran signboard, as against the so-called dead orthodoxy, as against the pietistic-unionist association work of our time, as against the false doctrine of church, office, and church government, as against the modern theory of the open questions and against the falsely famous science of our day, etc., etc., etc., etc. etc, and such testimony will be taken only from the public confessions of the church, from the private writings of its orthodox teachers and otherwise proven Lutheran theologians. The Lutheran Association does not make the symbols the source and ground of faith, but rather accepts them because they have flowed from the Bible as their source and are founded on the Bible as their ground, and therefore absolutely confesses the entire doctrinal content of the symbols of the Lutheran Church in the conviction, that if our church, now lying in the dust, is to rise again, and if a church is not to come into being under the best of appearances, which, apart from the name Lutheran, has nothing of the church of the Reformation, then no cry of ecclesiasticism, however loud, will help, no re-establishment of old outward customs and ceremonies, no clothing of the office with special glory and power, no synodal and church council ordinances, least of all Lutheran conferences, of which a number of members and speakers have long since documented their opinions, which dubiously deviate from the Lutheran confession, and thus their anti-Lutheran standpoint in writings, but nothing else helps but an ever more lively reappropriation of the old orthodox church confession, and an unconditional reaffirmation of it. Although this is in no way intended to deny that the teachings of the Church are capable of further development, the Lutheran Association hereby most solemnly renounces any alleged development of doctrine that does not take up where our Church left off, and wants nothing more and nothing less than to ask all Lutherans of German lands who do not intend to squander the inheritance of their fathers and who want to escape the finely spun Union net! hereby ask and encourage all Lutherans of German lands who do not intend to squander the inheritance of their fathers and want to escape the finely woven union net, to stand all the more faithfully by their banner, woven from the golden threads of the Word of God, to the orthodox confession of the Lutheran Church, the more the open and secret enemies of the Lutheran Church attack the confession of the same. With fraternal greetings we call out to all Lutherans: Hold what you have, lest anyone take your crown."

Oestreich. The Correspondent of the Evangelical Church in Austria paints the following picture of the Lutheran and Reformed ecclesiastical conditions in the issue of Nov. 25 of last year: "There is no lack of good elements anywhere. In the villages no less than in Vienna there are decidedly faithful Christians. They demand the whole Word of God, the ancient faith of the fathers. Whoever gives it in and under the pulpit can count on them. The more decided the testimony, the more grateful the recipients. The clearer the tone of the pose, the more

*) Dresden, Justus Naumann's Buchhandlung, price 8 Ngr.

more cheerful the listeners. The more cutting the polemic against all falsehood in the ecclesiastical nature, the more joyful the approval. While these Christians would rather avoid the church altogether than hear a preacher of unbelief, a believing pastor is sure to find them in their place in church at all times. He knows that they really hear, that they have spiritual judgment, and that they take so much of the gifts offered that he can only remember them with gratitude and joy. They come closer to him, attach themselves firmly to him, and cast a bright light on his often so dark official life. Among them, he encounters many traits of spiritual life, such as those drawn by the blessed Schubert in his biography of Kießling. However, their number is not great, if one excludes individual, very good rural parishes of Upper Austria, where one believes oneself to have been transported to Old Württemberg in ecclesiastical terms. In the cities, especially in Vienna, they are mostly foreigners, Prussians, Russians, French-Swiss, mostly belonging to the aristocracy according to their social position. To their Christianity is added a fine intellectual education. They are united in their abhorrence of the Austrian Protestantism. . The native majority of the congregations is a product of which the rationalistic preaching of lies can be proud. It has thus delivered its masterpiece. What was destructible, her poison has eaten away. Yes, the soil is so hardened and corrupted that it mocks all cultivation. By concealment of the "divine" currency, heathen ignorance is grown up. By insolent attacks on the mystery of godliness, pagan unbelief grew up. By dressing unbiblical unthinking with scraps of biblical words, an obscurity has arisen which, without perceiving any difference, would listen today to an angel, tomorrow to a devil as a preacher. Only with lamentation can one look upon these deceived people, shamefully cheated of their eternal salvation. They call themselves Evangelicals A. C. and H. C. They have no idea of the meaning of this name. They wear it like prisoners wear their numbers. The Reformation confessions have never been more shamefully misused than for such a mendacious signal. The content of these confessions is as foreign to those named after them as are the sayings of the Veda. If one lowers one's claims to a minimum, if one asks for any fundamental doctrine of the Lutheran church, there will be as little answer as if one sought information about the height of the moon mountains. Yes, the dereliction in stupidity and unbelief goes still further. He who spends his hours of devotion with Zschokke gets the smell of pietism. Those who offer their morning and evening sacrifices from Witschel betray a significant inclination toward obscurantism. A Jesuit is anyone who really believes and confesses the holy, apostolic creed. That is how far one has progressed. Without research, without science, the height of modern paganism was reached. The beer halls performed the same service as the theological lecture hall of a Schenkel. The Protestant Association may regard the Protestants of Eastern France as its born members; to them is due the chief place in this tumbledown piece of the German nation. Yet such a majority calls itself Protestant. Although it is considered a crime to be a Pietist, i.e., a Christian, she says to them: we are Protestants, with a self-feeling equal to the ***civis romanue*** sum. Wherewith does she justify her right to this name even of herself? One is not catholic. One believes nothing at all of the clergyman's fallacy - to which also belongs the word of God. One lets it cost something. You pay your church and school dues. One supports the Gustav-Adolfsverein. One gossips in the Wirthshause about church things. One refreshes oneself with scandalous stories from the Catholic Church. One lets progress live at the full table. They praise each other on their willingness to make sacrifices. One calculates the sums paid. The incense bowls are fragrant. One drinks to the victories of light. That's why you're a true Eastern Protestant. Those are the reasons. But don't people go to church? Certainly, churchgoing is flourishing. But whom do these true ones hear, and how do they hear? A preacher who whistles his little song like a music box. The phrase is slurped, for there is nothing in it to digest. The stirring orator purrs, and the well-fed patient pearls melt away. The pulpit comedian trembles about virtue and philanthropy, the trembling reaches to the stomach. The ecclesiastical anointer practices the art, in each

He is not aware, of course, of what he is doing - and to a sweet stupefaction the mill-wheel goes round in his head. The thoughtless maul hero rides as with Don Quixote's helmet, armed with a few sentences of the Reformers, against clergymen, Jesuits, bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, cardinals, the pope to the field, and the devout assembly hovers constantly between sky-cheering over the victories of reason and sorrowful to death over the stubborn night of dogma. What do the eights take with them? Well, what they had. What did they have? Nothing. It is understandable that this kind of Protestantism does not command the special respect of Catholics. Admittedly, we often encounter praise from Catholic mouths. It is only a pity that the donors give them a somewhat bitter aftertaste when they conclude in the lovely Viennese patois: "Look, all religions are the same to me, Jew, Gentile, Türk, Christian, I don't give a damn about anything. These are the Catholic eulogists."

Can a Protestant drink the Pope's health? In Hückeswagen (Rhine Province) the Catholic congregation celebrated the parish anniversary of their pastor Giesen on October 29. Since the Protestant pastors had also congratulated, they were also invited to the feast as guests of honor. Only one mission was carried out. The cathedral chaplain expressed the health of the pope, not of the papacy, which has fine opponents, but of the amiable personality (?!) of Pius IX, who has none. (?!) Why not wish the amiable man long life and early conversion? But the Protestant pastors did not agree, and in this one found an obvious neglect of a social form of spite and an intolerance of Catholics, although they only wanted to let their pope pay homage under a different form of Protestants. For why did they not bring out the health of some other amiable personage, why only that of the pope? That teaches that one stays away where one does not belong. (Münkel's Zeitbl.)

The Jesuit Father Roh answered Dr. F. Huber. When the latter asked Roh to designate to him the faculty of law where he could furnish his proof from a Jesuit book that, according to Jesuit doctrine, the end justifies the means; the "Badischer Beobachter" now replies, as it would seem, on Roh's behalf: "that the two faculties of Heidelberg or Bonn referred to by Father Roh in 1852 at Frankfort and in 1866 at Munich are by no means to be regarded as arbiters, but have only to testify that this or that work by a Jesuit was shown to them in which the principle in question is contained. This to the notice of Dr. Huber." This whistle resembles a Jesuit as much as an egg resembles an egg, but it sufficiently proves that Father Roh, who first demands that the whole world be put in its place and then makes off through a loophole at the right time, has never trusted his own assertion and, according to the principle that "the end justifies the means," has only wanted to throw sand in the eyes of the world. - Father Roh himself has replied in the "Mainzer Journal". He writes: "On various sides I am asked why I do not answer the summons issued to me by Dr. Franz Huber because of the 1000 florins, since some triumph over my silence as a defeat. Friends and foes alike, therefore, serve the following answer, Dr. Huber first asks me whether I can keep the promise I have made. I consider it beneath my dignity to answer this, Dr. Huber then says that the law faculty of Heidelberg halle not want to get involved with him. But I cannot help that. Maria-Laach, November 19, 1868. D. Roh, S. J." Huber had not said that the Faculty of Law did not want to get involved with him, but that they had no order from Roh to decide the dispute at all. For this Roh is very much to blame. But in spite of his insolence, the testimony of his defeat is entirely from his own mouth. (Münkel's Zeitbl.)

Infallibility of the Pope. This seems to be the basic topic of the forthcoming "general council". From Paris one writes to the Viennese "Volksfreund": "One speaks much of divisions in the French episcopate 'about the question of the infallibility of the Pope. There is no truth in this. It is true that Msgr. Märet, Bishop in ***partibus*** and, as Dean of the Sorbonne (theological faculty), an official of the Ministry of Education, is an opponent of infallibility, but he does not really belong to our Episcopate. The three or four friends he may have among our bishops have not in any way agreed, directly or indirectly, with his views on infallibility. He himself is so firmly convinced of his complete isolation that he is thinking of publishing his work on infallibility and the Conciliar, which is to comprise three strong volumes. Incidentally, the dogma of infallibility meets with no opposition in France. Almost all the bishops will say yes from the heart, four of five will perhaps raise objections of expediency, none will say no. Incidentally, this is the place to recall that the French episcopate was the first to demand the definition of the dogma of infallibility. Under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, 66 of our bishops wrote to the pope to this effect."

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume XV. April 1869. No. 4.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 31.

An extremely important part of the duties of a Christian preacher is the care for the sick and dying, first of all for their spiritual needs. It is true that the preacher has to exhort his congregation that whenever a member of the family falls ill, the relatives or whoever becomes aware of it should always report it to him in a timely manner (Jam. 5, 13. 14.).); but the preacher himself must diligently inquire whether a member of the congregation is sick, and as soon as he learns by any means that this is the case, not to wait for notification and invitation, but to visit the sick person as soon as possible, and to continue his visits as often as possible, according to circumstances, until the recovery or death of the patient. Ez.34, 1-16. Isa. 38, 1. Sir. 7, 39. Match. 25, 36. ff.

Note 1.

How high the duty of a preacher to visit the sick and dying within his congregation has ever been held in our church may be proved by the following extracts.

In the Saxon "General Articles", which were first drawn up in 1555 on the basis of the experiences made during church visitations, later increased and improved, and published in their present form in 1580, it says under No. XIV. among other things as follows: "The parish priests and church servants are to visit and comfort the sick, afflicted, distressed Christians often, but especially at times of death, and to administer to them, at their request, the reverend Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The parish priest shall refrain from any action against any person for the sake of the poor, and shall be just as ready to serve the poor in such cases as the rich. If a parishioner among his audience has fallen into a troublesome illness, with whom the pastor of the sick person's blessedness (has) something to talk about, the pastor shall not save this to the last, but shall also, without being called, find himself conducive to the sick person, with all Christian gentleness and modesty, to do due remembrance with comfort and admonition, because the sick person can still grasp this and still send himself Christianly to his death. The pastors and deacons should also visit the sick in the hospitals, where they exist, many times, give them the Holy Sacrament, and give the same to the sick with comfort and admonition. Sacrament, comfort them with God's word" etc. (The Most Serene Duke Augustus . . Order, how it should be kept in his Churf. G. Landen at the churches ... Leipzig 1580. fol. 318. f)

In the Würtemberger Kirchen-Ordnung of 1582 it is said: "The almighty, merciful God has so graciously taken care of the wretched and afflicted who call upon his name out of right trust that he not only promises them all fatherly protection and help, but also carries this title in particular under the surname of his majesty, that he is a refuge of the wretched, a savior of them that are of a contrite heart, and hath more than once sought to change the natural course of heaven and earth, than to forsake the wretched in their affliction. Besides this, the Son of God also calls to him all who are afflicted and promises them help: "Come to me," he says, "all you who are afflicted and burdened, and I will give you rest. Now the sick are not the least of the afflicted and burdened, as those who have great affliction and temptation, not only because of their bodily sickness, but also because of sin, death, and condemnation, of which they are reminded by the sickness. For this reason, the ministers of the church should take care of the sick who desire their service with all seriousness and diligence and, by virtue of their profession, prove Christian comfort to them. For all kinds of moving reasons, it seems good to us that the church ministers also show and offer their good will and service to the sick who do not desire it, either through themselves or through their relatives and friends. (By God's Grace ours, Ludwig's, Duke of Würtemberg, ... summary and simple concept, how it . . should be held and executed in the churches of our principality. Tüwingen 1582. col. 146. f.)

In the Princely Saxon. Ernestine decrees it says: "If the pastor hears that one of his listeners has become dangerously ill or has otherwise been distressed by an afflictive case, he shall not only willingly and gladly attend the same upon prior request, but also without being asked, however, upon prior request.

(2) If the saint is not in the presence of the saint, the saint is to visit the saint and, according to his need, to take care of his ministry with comfort and other encouragement. Unless, perhaps, one has been a wanton despiser of the divine word and the holy sacraments, and his persistent impenitence has also been connected with the fact that he has been a priest. (†) In which case a priest is not exactly obliged to come immediately without being asked, although great care must be taken here, lest some opportunity be missed to convert the impenitent and to snatch a poor soul out of the devil's jaws. In particular, however, a priest must take care that he does not fall into wanton suspicion, as if his visit were more concerned with the accidens than with the sick person's soul and bliss." ‡ (Princely Saxon ordinances concerning the church and school system. Gotha 1720. p. 106.)

Felix Bidembach, because. Court Preacher at Stuttgart, speaks about this as follows: "St. Paul writes 2 Thess. 5, 14; 'Comfort the fainthearted, carry the weak? This concerns all Christians in general, but especially the preachers and ministers of God's word, who are especially commanded not only to read and exhort (1 Tim. 4, 13.), but also to speak comforting words to men (1 Cor. 14:3), to comfort those who are in trouble according to the examples of the apostles (2 Cor. 1:4), and to exhort, testify, and comfort each one as a father does his children (1 Thess. 2:11). Now we have need of exhortation, comforting, and other things every day and hour, and in all our life, but especially and most of all when we come to the deathbed and are to die. As the minister of the church is at all times obliged to watch over the souls of his hearers (Ebr. 13:17), as he must give an account of it, so at the time when the devil most strives to snatch away a lamb from him, when one is to depart from this world and die, he should not fail in his office to exhort, teach, comfort, and in all other ways. And so in this place it needs all the more care and watchfulness, because the sick and dying people are very unequal. For there are not always among the community all pious and kind-hearted, zealous Christians, who take good care of their own souls' salvation and happiness, and who, as soon as the Almighty attacks them with a painful and dangerous illness, desire the soul's medicine and the minister's help; but there are also many of them.

---

*This registration may, of course, be made at the door; its only purpose is that the preacher may avoid the appearance of imposing himself. L. and W.

†) In properly ordered congregations this can, of course, be applied only to those who are confined. Moreover, the preacher, when called, must not refuse to visit even those sick who do not belong to his congregation, provided that they are not already members of another congregation, in which case he would be encroaching on another's ministry by officially visiting the sick. L. and W.

‡) It has already been pointed out that it is most advisable for the preacher not to accept anything offered for visiting the sick. L. and W.

Patients who, either out of childish conceit, do not desire a minister to the last necessity, fearing that they must die the sooner if they desire the minister too soon, or who otherwise have no great desire to be reconciled to God at this time, but postpone their repentance from one day to another. Now if it should happen that a minister has such a secure patient among his congregation (but it is to be feared that he might die), our ecclesiastical ordinance first of all directs that he should not or must not wait until he is called upon to do so, but should take care of the sick person himself.... If, however, a sick person (as he is obliged to do as a Christian) should himself desire the assistance of the churchwarden and seek the soul's archangel in the best possible way, then every competent churchwarden would at all times, day and night,*) appear willingly to both patients." (Handbook for the young aspiring church servants. Stuttgart 1603. p. 643. ff.) Ludwig Hartmann testifies: "There is no doubt that visiting the sick and bedridden in their homes, in order to comfort them, is an extremely necessary work and should not be omitted for the sake of difficulty or danger of infection. Since, for the sake of their sickness, they are not permitted to be present at the public divine service, it is necessary for their souls to be refreshed privately, so that they may not succumb helplessly in such distresses, when Satan so cunningly shoots his fiery darts at them." (pastoral. ev. p. 1287.) Gottfried Olearius begins his instruction on visiting the sick with the words, "An evangelical Seelenhtrte, in case his sheep entrusted to him are afflicted with sickness, has not to wait until he is called to the same, but he must rather seize this opportunity of doing good with him for himself." (*Collegium pastorale*, or Instruction for the Spiritual Cure of the Soul. Leipzig 1718. p. 838.) JohannFecht writes: "If every Christian owes to another the duty of visiting him in sickness, how much more the church servant to his sheep! Hence it is expressly commanded in some church ordinances that the pastor, without waiting for an invitation, visit the sick." (*Instruct, pastor..* c. 10. § 2. p. 90.) At last Christoph Tim. writes. Seidel: "That the care of the sick already constituted a part of the teaching office in apostolic times is clear from James 5:14, where it is said that the presbyters pray over the sick and anoint them with oil at the end.

*It is true that some people often call the preacher to the bedside at the most inopportune time, because they do not do so until there are signs of a death that is about to occur; but the preacher should never show dissatisfaction or unwillingness, but should always accept the invitation with the greatest readiness and friendliness. Reminders to call at more convenient times belong to other times and occasions. L. & W.

so that the sick might have a sign of the gift given to the teachers at the planting of the church to heal the sick. And this is undoubtedly the reason why the ancients built inns, taverns, and parishes very close to each other, so that those who encounter an accident on their journey do not have to look far for the preacher's help. The nature of the preaching office itself requires this duty from a teacher, because a sick person cannot help himself, but is in need of the most assistance at the time.... Preachers are seldom concerned about sick children, but they are generally left to die without any encouragement, because they believe that they are still in the grace of the baptismal covenant and that there is no reason to doubt their blessedness. But we count it among the contempt of the little ones, against which Christ so earnestly warns in Matt. 18, and consider it a decay of our church. A conscientious teacher will consider the following as his duty: 1. Since little children also receive the sacrament of baptism, it is the duty of the teacher to invoke God even for the smallest sick children, that he may preserve the faith wrought in them in baptism, and impart to them the goods of grace promised in baptism. Either one does not believe that the Spirit of God has been poured out upon such children, or one must acknowledge himself bound to seek the grace of the Spirit for such unborn children and those who cannot help themselves. The blessedness of such a child, which is neglected, is not lost by this, but the neglecting teacher will bear his burden. (2) Children who are already of such years that they can grasp a part of the truths of the faith by memory, must be visited by the teacher as a matter of necessity. He is bound to reproach them with much love for their youthful sins, to admonish them, to make atonement for them to their parents, and to lead them to the merit of Christ. We know that the sickness of children is often awakening, and that the workings of the Spirit of God are very clearly manifested in their souls. - Friedrich Eberh. Rambach makes the following good comment on this: "A teacher also finds a good opportunity to prepare such parents for the death of their children, who are attached to them with a disorderly love, who act unthoughtfully because of this loss, who sometimes utter harsh words against the divine government, and think that they are therefore justly angry with God. To such he certainly renders a great service in such a visit, when he prepares them for such a case, and holds such truths before their hearts, by which they may be moved to serene submission to the divine will." (Pastoral Theology with a Preface edited by F. E. Rambach. Leipzig 1769. p. 211. f. 213. f.) In any case, the visit of sick children on the part of the preacher will be all the more indispensable, the less it can be expected on the part of certain parents that they will do their duty to their sick child with a view to its soul.

Note 2.

No matter how disgusting and contagious the diseases may be, the preacher must never allow himself to be moved to refrain from visiting the sick. Even the student of theology should therefore harden himself against the impressions of disgusting, awe-inspiring diseases by visiting hospitals and the like, but the pastor in such cases, before he visits the sick, should not only seek to compose himself well in God through God's Word and prayer, but also never visit a person afflicted with a contagious disease completely sober. *)

Only where several preachers work at one congregation, can one or the other, who is the most furious in God, be set apart to visit the sick at the time of pestilence or other epidemic, contagious diseases. Luther writes about this: "Those who are in spiritual office, as preachers and pastors, are also obligated to stand and remain in mortal and mortal need; for there stands a public command of Christ John 10:12: A good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep, but a hireling seeth the wolf coming and running; for in dying the spiritual office may be most exalted, that with God's Word and Sacrament it may strengthen and comfort the conscience to overcome death by faith. But if there were so many preachers, and they united themselves among themselves, that they exhorted some of them to depart, as those who remain without need in such danger, I think it should not be a sin; because otherwise the ministry would be sufficiently provided for, and they are willing and ready to remain where it is necessary; just as it was said of St. Athanasius that he fled from his church, that his life might be saved, because otherwise there were many who waited for the ministry." (X, 2324.) Of the same subject we read in Luther's Table Talks: "When one said that at Nuremberg two preachers had died of the pestilence, it was asked whether a preacher, who alone is appointed to the office of preaching, might with a good conscience refuse to minister to sick people at the time of the pestilence, so that he would not visit them? To this Dr. M. Luther answered and said: By no means, the preachers must not flee too much, lest they make the people too fearful. And that it is sometimes said that preachers and parish priests should be spared, and that they should not be too much burdened at the time of the pestilence, is because, if the pestilence should sometimes take away part of the chaplains, there should be others to visit the sick; item, that not every one should shun the priests at such times; as

*) We have experienced the case that a young, zealous preacher of our synod visited a sick person with yellow fever early in the morning, without having taken anything to eat, and when he breathed in the vapor emanating from the sick person, he immediately noticed the infecting effect and after a few hours was stricken with the same disease and died of it. - To overcome all fear of infection, the reading of Luther's delicious writing of 1527, "Ob man vor dem Sterben fliege möge?" ("Whether one may flee from dying?"), should do especially splendid service. (X, 2321-49.)

For it is seen that no man goeth to them, and that every man fleeth them. Therefore it would be good not to afflict them all, but one or two. If this fate were to befall me, I would not shrink from it or be afraid. I have now endured three pestilences, and have also been with some who had them, as a harmless forest; he had two of them (pestilence bumps), which I understood very well. But it did me no harm, praise God! I came home the same time and grabbed my Margarethen, who was still small at the time, around the mouth with unwashed hands; but I had truly forgotten, otherwise I would not have done it, because God would have tempted me." (XXII, 1070. f.)

Where there is only one preacher, he cannot, without becoming a miserable hireling, refrain from diligently visiting even those afflicted with contagious diseases. If Luther wants to sketch the picture of a right preacher, he therefore writes in that strange letter: "Admonition to a Pastor that he should not remain silent about the unjust dismissal of a preacher," in 1531, among other things, the following: "You know that you are the rightly appointed pastor and pastoral caretaker of the churches of N... You know that you are the rightly appointed pastor and pastoral caretaker of the church at N., so that on that day you must give an account for the same church that has been commanded to you, and you are obliged, as long as you live, to supply it with pure doctrine, to pray for it with earnestness, to care for it, to watch over it, and to protect your life in all kinds of distress and danger, as pestilence and other diseases, as they are called, and to stand at the forefront against the gates of hell, and to do, suffer, and endure everything that is due to a pious, faithful pastor and minister. All of which are indeed heavy, great, even divine works." (X, 1892.)

_____"

(Submitted.)

On the resurrection before the millennial kingdom.

Offenb. 20.

As the representatives of the Synod of Iowa, on the occasion of the colloquy recently held between them and representatives of the Synod of Missouri, have dropped several moments of gross chiliasm, but have declared that they must hold fast their doctrine of a double bodily resurrection; it will not be thought superfluous if we consider somewhat more carefully this important point, which, however, affects the analogy of the Christian faith.

The passage in question, according to the Lutheran translation, reads: "And I saw chairs, and they sat down thereon, and judgment was given unto them: and the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God; and they that had not worshipped the beast, nor his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads.

And on their hands they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of them that died lived not again, till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed is he, and holy, that hath part in the first resurrection; over such the other death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him (literally, and be kings with him) a thousand years."

Now what is this first resurrection? Resurrection, *ἀνάστασις*, according to the origin of the word, means nothing else than: Aufstehn. Thus John of Damascus, who still spoke Greek as his mother tongue, says: Resurrection is the rising again of one who has fallen.*) And Matthias Flacius: Resurrection means to rise again after a fall or because one has lain or sat down. **) Yes, the tense *(ἀνίστασϋαϊ*) means in the New Testament in by far the most places simply: to rise from one's seat. Matth. 9, 9.; 26, 62. Marc. 2, 14.; 10, 50.; 14, 60. Luc. 4, 16. 89.; 9, 8.; 24, 12. Joh. 11, 31. Acts 1, 15.; 9, 39. 1 Cor. 10, 7. etc. a. St. That these two expressions (Auferstehung and aufstehn) now fit excellently to the general resurrection at the last day, is evident. For when the trumpet sounds with the sound of the miracle, the lying corpses will rise up to meet the Lord Jesus. But the Scripture needs both expressions *(ἀνάστασις* and *ἀνίστασϋαϊ*) also transferred. For the natural man lies, spiritually considered. And that for no less reason than because he is fallen. If it is to be otherwise with him, he must rise. Therefore Simeon does not know how to express the saving power of the Christ child more strikingly than with his: this one is set for the resurrection of many (ις *ἀνάσταβιν*) in Israel (Luc. 2, 34.). That the resurrection of the flesh is not to be thought of here, is shown once by the: "many," and then by the contrast: **to** a fall and rising of many. But if it is not the resurrection of the flesh, what kind of resurrection is it of which Simeon speaks here? I think so: the resurrection of the soul. Or is there a third? Of the same resurrection, namely, the resurrection of the soul, Paul also deals, when he calls Ephes. 5:14. to sinners, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise *(ἀνάστα*) from among the dead, and Christ shall enlighten thee." Here the Holy Spirit needs the same word, wherewith he also pictures the resurrection of bodies. Yea, Col. 3, 1. He even says; "If ye then be raised with Christ (αυνηγέρ& *ητε τφ Χριστώ*), seek those things which are above.** This is the first resurrection. How does it come to pass? By faith. Here it is, "In whom ye were buried with him through baptism, in whom also ye were raised up through faith, which God worketh" (χαϊ *συνηγέρ& ητε Sta.*

*) *ἀνάστασις γάρ ίστι Δευτέρα του πεπτωχότος στάσις.* Joannes Damascenus, Orthodoxae fidei lib. IV. cap. 28. ed. Basileensis. 392.

της πίστεως της ένεργείας του ^εοϋ, , Col. 2, 12. Read also Rom. 6, 4.) And this first resurrection, which is by faith, began already in the time of Christ. For the Lord declares Joh. 5, 25.; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and is already now, that they which are dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they which shall hear shall live." How could it be otherwise? He that believed Christ had eternal life, had passed from death unto life (John 5:24). This first resurrection, the resurrection of souls, is therefore partial, and does not extend to all; the second resurrection, on the other hand, of which 1 Cor. 15 deals, the resurrection of the flesh, is universal. For the Lord teaches in John 5:28 that all who are in the graves will hear his voice on the last day. And the apostle: "As in Adam they all die, so in Christ they shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22). This is the pure teaching of the Word of God about the double resurrection.

The Fathers also teach: "The Redeemer," says St. Ambrose, "taught two kinds of resurrection. St. Ambrose taught two kinds of resurrection. Likewise John in the Revelation, where he says: Blessed is he who has part in the first resurrection. If we are resurrected from the dead here, we shall also be resurrected there. "*) And Augustine on John 5:25: "The Lord does not speak here of the second resurrection, the resurrection of bodies, which will take place at the end; but of the first, which is now. To designate this (first resurrection) clearly, he says, the hour is coming, and is already now. But this (first resurrection) is not a resurrection of bodies, but a resurrection of souls. For souls also have their death (namely) in ungodliness and sins. These are the dead, of whom the Lord saith, Let the dead bury their dead; that is, let the spiritually dead bury the bodily dead. With respect to such as are spiritually dead, that is, dead in ungodliness and sin, the Lord has said, the hour is coming, and is already now, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. If we thus believe in him that justifieth the ungodly.... we may have part in the first resurrection which is now. For in this first resurrection no one has a part who will not be eternally saved; but the second, of which (the Lord) will speak below, belongs to the blessed and the damned. The first resurrection is that of mercy; the second resurrection is that of judgment. So whoever does not want to be damned in the second resurrection must (first) be resurrected in the first. Those who are not resurrected in the first resurrection, that is, in the resurrection of souls, become a prey to death after the second resurrection, that is, after the resurrection of bodies. ... As then there are two rebirths, one according to faith, which is now by

*) *Salvator duo genera resurrectionis posuit, et Joannes in apocalypsi dicens:*
beatus qui habet partem in prima resurrectione. . . . they hic resurrexerimus a mortuis,
et illic resurgamus. Ambrose in psalmum 35, opera IV, 474.

The first, which is now, is the resurrection of the soul, which is preserved from the second death; and the second, which is not now, but at the end of the world, is the resurrection of bodies, not of souls. This second will send some through the gate of the last judgment into the second death, and the others into the life that knows no death. Of these two resurrections the evangelist John has dealt in the Revelation. And that in such a way that the (so-called) first resurrection is not understood by some of ours, even twisted into certain ridiculous fables." *) Luther teaches no less clearly: "Col. 2:12: Ye are buried with Christ through baptism, in whom also ye are risen with him through faith, whereby God worketh in you. Therefore the apostle does not speak here of the future bodily resurrection, but of the spiritual, for the sake of which also this must take place; (our resurrection takes place) first after the souls from the sinful and damnable life into a right divine and blessed life, and afterwards also from this sinful and deadly maggot-sack out of the grave. If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is at the right hand of God. By this he means to prove that you have already been raised spiritually, and that by the same power you will also be raised bodily,

*) Nondum de secunda resurrectione i. c. corporum loquitur, quae in fine futura est, sed de prima, quae nunc est. Hanc quippe ut distingueret, ait: Venit hora et nunc est. Non autem ista corporum, sed animarum est. Habent enim et animae mortem suam in impietate atque peccatis. Secundum quam mortem mortui sunt, de quibus idem dominus ait: sine mortuos sepelire mortuos suos, ut scilicet in anima mortui in corpore mortuos sepelirent. Propter istos ergo impietate et iniquitate in anima mortuos: venit, inquit, hora et nunc est, quando mortui audiunt vocem filii Dei, et qui audierint vivent ... ut credentes in eum, qui justificat impium, ex impietate justificati, tanquam ex morte vivificati ad primam resurrectionem, quae nunc est, pertinere possimus. Ad hanc enim primam non pertinet, nisi qui beati erunt in aeternum ; ad secundam vero, de qua mox locuturus est, et beatos pertinere docebit et miseros. Ista est misericordiae, illa judicii.... Resurgat ergo . in prima, qui non vult in secunda resurrectione damnari.... In mortem (secundam) post secundam, quae corporum futura est, resurrectionem praecipitabuntur, qui in prima, quae animarum est, non resurgunt.... Sicut ergo duae sunt regenerationes, . . . una secundum fidem, quae nunc fit per baptismum, alia secundum carnem, quae fiet in ejus incorruptione atque immortalitate per judicium magnum atque novissimum. Ita sunt et resurrectiones duae, una prima, quae et nunc est et animarum est, quae venire non permittit in mortem secundam; alia secunda,quae nunc non est, sed in saeculi fine futura est, nec animarum sed corporum est, quae per ultimum judiciun alios mittet in secundam mortem, alios in eam vitam, quae non habet mortem. ... De his duabus resurrectionibus idem Joannes evangelista in eo libro, qui dicitur apocalypsis, eo modo locutus est, ut earum prima a quibusdam nostris non intellecta, insuper etiam in quasdam ridiculas fabulas verteretur. Augustine, de civitate Dei, XX. 6. 7. (Opera V, 259.)

That ye may seek and seek after that which is above, that is, divine, heavenly, and eternal." *) Even more decisively Calov declares, "There is a twofold resurrection: one is the first, spiritual, in that we rise from spiritual death, that is, from sins, through regeneration and justification, ...the other is the second, bodily, in that our bodies (are) raised from the dust of this earth, and quickened with a new life. This (second resurrection) is on the one hand a blessed one of the righteous, and on the other hand an unblessed one of the damned." **This doctrine of the first resurrection was so important and familiar to the Christians of the apostolic times that some even overshot the mark and thought that everything the Scriptures said about the resurrection in general was already fulfilled in this first resurrection. Not only the first resurrection, but the resurrection itself had already happened. At least this is what the apostle Paul says of Hymenaeus and Philetus, †) But as little as we are to let Hymenaeus and Philetus disprove the second resurrection, which has not yet come to pass, so little and much less are the chiliasts of to-day to disprove the first, which has indeed already come to pass. For if we let the second, bodily resurrection be talked out of our minds, we would only *per consequens* (i.e. indirectly) overthrow the ground of our faith; ††) but if we denied that the first resurrection in particular had already happened to us, we would at the same time confess ourselves to be slaves of sin and heathen. But this we do not want. Rather, we confess with Scripture that there is a twofold resurrection: a first, spiritual resurrection here in the kingdom of grace, and a second, bodily resurrection at the sound of the trumpet. And how could it be otherwise? There is also a twofold coming of Christ: one for redemption, which has already taken place, and one for judgment. But the first coming of Christ wrought the first resurrection, ‡) so the other coming works the second. ‡‡)

Let us now turn to the scriptural doctrine of the double resurrection, Revelation 20:4-6, where it says: "The souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which worshipped not the beast, neither his image, neither received his mark in their foreheads, or in their hands; these lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest who died did not come to life again until the thousand years were completed. This is the first

*) Luther in the church postilion. Erlanger Ausgabe VIII, 204.

**) *Atque hinc gemina resurrectio est: alia prima et spiritualis, quum a morte spirituali, a peccatis resurgimus per regenerationem et justificationem, eo fine ut sanctificemur et sancti simus,... et secunda ac corporalis, quum corpora nostra e pulvere terrae excitantur et vita nova animantur, quae vel beata est justorum vel infelix reproborum. Calovius, Loci XII, 95. 96.*

†) 2 Tim. 2, 17. 18. ††) 1 Cor. 15, 13. 14.

‡) Luc. 2, 34. Joh. 11, 25": I am the resurrection and the life. Whoever believes in me will live, even if he dies. Joh. 5, 24. 25.

‡‡) Joh. 5, 27-29. 1 Thess. 4, 16.

Resurrection." What is the first resurrection? Yet not actually the life (xx) of the saints, but the being made alive which preceded that life. So the text says: During the millennial reign of Christ, His saints also live with Him as kings. Both those in heaven and those on earth. But lest any one should think that he is speaking of the resurrection of the flesh, he makes the word souls the subject; and at the end, in order to remove all misunderstanding, he expressly adds that he is speaking of the first resurrection. The first resurrection, he says, not: a first resurrection. That is, the spiritual resurrection, which is well known to you from the Lord's discourses. Did St. John mean to say something new and unheard of? If St. John meant to teach something new and unheard-of, for instance, that a few hundred martyrs would receive their flesh again a thousand years before the last day, he could not speak in this way; at most he could say: this is an anticipation of the resurrection, a first resurrection. But he did not speak in this way. But as he teaches nothing new and unheard of in his Revelation, so also here. He rather explains his description of the kingdom of Christ by a simple reference to the old terminology (way of expression) that is well known to his churches. I am talking here - he explains himself -, about the first resurrection. And let us not forget: the same John who says this, also wrote Ev. Joh. 5, 25. I think, if the man through whose pen the Lord's word of the first resurrection has passed, if the man needs the expression, I speak here of the first resurrection; let us be doublyware of foisting upon him a new monstrosity, of which neither Scripture knows anything, nor the church built upon it. -

Now we also understand the words, "The rest of them that were dead were not quickened till the thousand years were finished." If the first resurrection is the spiritual resurrection, so also the dead here are the spiritually dead. Only do not object to us: "Dead" cannot mean so much as "spiritually dead. The Lord Himself said without a gloss: Let the dead bury their dead (Matth. 8, 22.). So John here simply excludes a part of mankind (the spiritually dead, for originally we are all spiritually dead) from the first resurrection. And this agrees perfectly with the analogy of faith, for this is just the main difference between the spiritual resurrection and the resurrection of the flesh, that the latter is granted to all, while the latter is granted only to some. The sixth verse finally reads thus: "Blessed is he, and holy, that hath part in the first resurrection. Over such the other death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him (literally, be kings with him) a thousand years." Blessed, then, are those of the first resurrection for three reasons: First, because they shall not see the second death; second, because they shall be priests; and third, because they shall be kings. And now read John 11:25, 26..:

Jesus says: I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. But John saith, Blessed is he, and holy, that hath part in the first resurrection. Over such the other death has no power. I should really have become quite senseless, or - it is quite the same thing. Yes, not only the same, but John the Theologian has undoubtedly done nothing more than clothe the words of Christ in his own way. And now these strange enthusiasts come along and write a whole novel about the apostle, because they are utterly unable to enter into the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Christ. This carnal Jewish spirit really cannot be banished. As soon as they hear the word "kingdom," they think it will be a great thing. And yet it is a poor kingdom of the cross. They no sooner hear..: Resurrection, halt! they think, that is, a resurrection of the flesh. And yet this first resurrection is a very hidden thing. - Our Saviour has indeed spoken often enough and clearly enough of this resurrection. Just read Joh. 11, 26., Joh. 5, 24. and Joh. 8, 51. According to this his opinion is: We are all dead in sins. He that believeth in him liveth. And the end is eternal life. Well, the dear John also knew this, he reported it himself. And at the end of his life he repeated it in his own way: "He that is raised spiritually shall not die.

But more than this, he that riseth up spiritually also becometh a priest. Oh, here come our Jewish Christians (we do not mean the Iowans, of course) again: Before their delighted gaze rises a new great temple of the Jews, with it excellent incense, sacrifices, and accessories. And what is the opinion of the text? Read 1 Peter 2:5: "And ye also, as the living stones, build you up a spiritual house, and a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable unto God through Jesus Christ." So we Christians are the spiritual priests. Or in the words of Revelation: "All those who have been raised spiritually for the first time are also priests. And kings too, I suppose? Of course, kings too. Read only four verses further. There the apostle Peter calls us in all seriousness: a royal priesthood. What do I say to Peter? John the Theologian, the same for whose prophecy we are here disputing, boasts in Cap. 1:5 and 6: "Jesus Christ hath loved us, and washed us from sins in his blood. And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father (xal οίησεν *βασιλείς χαί ίερεϊς τω & εω χά'ΐ πατρί αυτου*). Now I ask every one: here (Cap. 20, v. 6.) John says, Blessed is he, and holy, that hath part in the first resurrection. They shall be priests of God and of Christ, and kings with him a thousand years. And here (Cap. 1, v. 6.): He hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father. Surely this is clear: In the so-called millennial kingdom there will be no other glory than that which was already present in the time of St. John. John. Perhaps someone is like

so wise and conclusive: The millennial kingdom must have begun at the time of the apostle. But the most distasteful thing of all is the assertion that the first resurrection stands at the threshold of the millennial kingdom. Like this: first a great resurrection, then the resurrected reign, as they are there, a thousand years in succession. The text of the Apocalypse at least does not offer the slightest support for this fantasy. But Cap. 20, v. 4, simply says of the Christians that they live and are kings. The souls of the perfected, of course, in heaven, the souls of the wanderers here still in their bodies. Then v. 5. is said to speak here of the first resurrection. That is: all this glory, life, and kingship of the saints is spiritual, and rests on their spiritual resurrection. Then all who receive a share in the spiritual resurrection are once more blessed (D. 6). Nowhere is there a syllable of general and sudden upheaval. But throughout, the idea that Christians will live with Christ for a long time before Satan prepares for the final battle. The first resurrection continues quietly throughout this time. Today this one is spiritually raised, tomorrow that one. And all who are resurrected during these thousand years are blessed and holy; neither has the other death any power over them. On the other hand, those who do not come to life again during this whole time perish. Thus we declare with the fathers.*)

But if the first resurrection is spiritual, then nothing else but the Christian church can be understood by the millennial kingdom. At least this is what St. Augustine taught. St. Augustine taught so. The church of today, he says, is this kingdom of Christ, and now his saints reign with him. Of this kingdom of war, in which we are at this very hour at war with the enemy, now resisting the sins that beset us, now victoriously suppressing them, until we come into that Sabbath-quiet kingdom, where there is rule without enemies; and of this first (spiritual) resurrection,

*) Augustinus de civitate Dei XX, 9. In apocalypsin homilia 17. (Opp. IX, 365.) Flacius, Glossa 1386. B. : praedicat istam primam spiritualemque resurrectionem, quae complectitur etiam justificationem ac regenerationem, de qua etiam modo quarto versu dixit. Quod autem ibi dixerat: Vivent, hoc hic exponit, quod secunda mors, i. c. aeterna damnatio nullam potestatem sit habitura in eos, sed sint futuri perpetui sacerdotes Christi. Clavis 1065. 1066.: Tertio resurrectio usurpatur etiam de justificatione . . . qua in hac vita ex aeterna morte injustitiae et irae Dei ad veram spiritualemque vitam resurgimus. . . . Hanc resurrectionem vocat apocalypsis c. XX. 5. 6. primam resurrectionem. Conf. col. ii. 12. - Calov., Loci IV. 1913.: Illud εζησαν vixerunt vel ut alii *ἀνθησαν* revixerunt, de resurrectione prima explicatur, quae spiritualis est. Vita ergo occisorum pro Christo spiritualis intelligitur: nec opus est explicetur de resurrectione corporali, quae nunquam distribuitur in primam et secundam.... reliqui, spiritualiter sc. mortui, qui non resurrexerunt prima resurrectione seu regeneratione, non revixerunt, sed manserunt in morte spirituali. ... De animabus sermo est, ut vers. 4., quibus convenit vita vel resurrectio prima et spiritualis, non autem corporalis.

which is now, Revelation 20, 4-6. †) And the mighty ones of this earth knew this, as far as they were Christian, as well as the teachers. To the saints, says Charlemagne, who, having overcome the devil, now reign with Christ, their honor is due. *) Whether the thousand years be taken in this or that way, whether they signify a longer period of time, the limits of which the wisdom of God has willed to conceal from us, or something else - this is certain: until the last day Christ reigns in the midst of his enemies. This is taught in all the Scriptures, and perhaps most clearly in Ps. 110: "The Lord hath said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." - So the prophecy begins with this: ascended up to heaven, seated at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; all that follows falls after. And what follows? "The HER will send the scepter of thy kingdom (actually : of thy power) out of Zion, reign among thine enemies (literally, reign in the midst of thine enemies). In the day (i.e. at the time) of thy power thy people shall willingly sacrifice unto thee in the holy ornament. Thy children shall be born unto thee as the dew out of the morning glow." This is the millennial kingdom. "So we have here - Luther declares - summarized in the shortest and yet most comprehensive way, both who this Lord and King is, what power and authority he has, and how it is done about his regiment or rule, which is Christianity on earth, what and who it is, and how it is done, namely, that it shall exist and remain forever, as long as the world stands, because Christ sits above, contrary to the world and devils. ... That no such kingdom be made of it, nor such a church sought, as reigneth bodily on earth, with outward worldly power, as the pope leadeth. . .. Or, as the Anabaptists and such erroneous spirits dream, as if such a church should be brought together before the last day, where all pious and Christian ... . should reign peaceably without all opposition and contestation. For this text clearly and powerfully says that as long as this Christ reigns on earth, enemies shall remain forever, and indeed it is certain that death will not be removed until the last day, when all his enemies shall be destroyed at once." **)

†) Ergo ecclesia et nunc est regnum Christi, regnantque itaque cum illo etiara nunc sancti ejus. ... De hoc ergo regno militiae, in quo adhuc cum hoste confligitur, et aliquando repugnatur repugnantibus vitiis, aliquando cedentibus imperatur, donec veniatur ad illud pacatissimum regnum, ubi sine hoste regnabitur, et de hac prima resurrectione, quae nunc est, liber iste sic loquitur ... regnat itaque cum Christo nunc primum ecclesia in vivis et mortuis. Augustinus de civitate Dei, XX. 9.

**Luther in the explanation of the 110th Psalm. Works of Walch V. 1400. 1401.

(Sent in by Rev. E. W. Keyl.)

About funeral orations.

Funeral orations are worthy of all diligence. Like the Gospel of the young man at Nain, they should present us with two processions: a procession of the dead, which sings, "In the midst of life we are embraced with death," and a procession of life, which sings the song of triumph: "In the midst of death we are embraced with life. Funeral orations should testify where death comes from, namely from sin, and where life comes from, namely from Christ. They should encourage us to be always ready for death, and to be always in communion with Christ, the overcomer of death and the restorer of life. They should encourage us to make faithful use of our precious time of grace. They are to remind us that just as the day of our death meets us here, so the last day will meet us. They are to give us examples of those who have died in their sins, but also of those who have fallen asleep in Christ. Let them help to keep the memory of the righteous, and of all the good things God has done for them and through them for others, in blessing. They are to comfort their faithful survivors in their sorrow with the consolations of God, and to direct their gaze from sin and death, from the grave and decay, to the glory to come, where God will wipe away all tears from their eyes, where there will be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor pain, for the former things have passed away. - All these things shall more or less resound in funeral orations.

To achieve this goal, I know of no better guide than Dr. Luther, both in terms of the choice of texts and the wealth of material. Much of what belongs here has been compiled in older and more recent (oncordances under the articles death, resurrection, eternal life, etc.). However, it is far more advisable for preachers to first compile an index of general texts according to the order of the biblical books as well as an alphabetical collection of materials from Luther's writings, which offer a rich yield for this purpose. Such writings are the following: The four funeral sermons at the burial of the two Churfürsten von Sachsen in the 1st 1525 and 1532, Luther having delivered two each on the text 1 Thess. 4, 13-18. (Walch's ed. 12, 2578 f.)

The first of these four sermons is a sermon of consolation against death, in which, after an introduction of the mourning over the dead, he speaks of two reasons of consolation against death, namely that death is only a sleep to believing Christians and that the dead will one day rise again.

In the second sermon he teaches about the last day, Christ and the resurrection.

The third sermon, after a short entrance, contains, as in the first sermon, an instruction of the consolation in the dying of pious Christians,

That Christ died and rose again for us; then he shows the application to the death of the Elector.

In the fourth sermon he gives an exhortation and consolation in mourning our dead, and adds a lesson of the last day.

At the end of the house postilion, we find two more of Luther's funeral sermons. The first of these, on the Gospel of 16 Sonnt, n. Tr., shows how Christians should console themselves over the deceased. In the other sermon, he teaches what thoughts Christians should have when they accompany a corpse, and then he gives a short lesson on the evaluation of questionable deaths.

Next, the following sermons from both postils can be used with benefit:

Of Simeon's blessed death, on the day of the Purification of Mary.

Two examples of the judgment of God that will be passed upon men after this life, on the 1st of Sunday, A.D. Trin.

The raising of the young man of Nain, on the 7th Sun. a. Trin. Trin.

The miraculous work of Christ in the Son of the King", on the 21st of Sunday, after Trinity.

The miraculous work of Christ on the daughter of Jairus, on the 24th Sunday after Trinity.

Furthermore, the entire Easter sermons, the four sermons on 1 Cor. 15, 35-57, as well as the interpretation of this entire chapter belong here.

Finally, the following writings should be mentioned:

The interpretation of the 90th Psalm according to the only reliable translation by V. Dietrich. Dietrich's.

Sermon of Bekeitung to die. (Walch 10, 2292.)

The consolation writings bet the death of spouses, parents, siblings, and friends. (Walch's ed. 10, 2350-2374.)

From the Table Talks Cap. 47-51.

The directory of Bible verses. (Walch's ed. 14, 416.)

Finding a puffing text and its use is often facilitated by taking into account the ecclesiastical times, e.g. Advent, Christmas, the smaller feasts as well as the next evangelical or epistolary pericope. Thus, in a funeral oration at the beginning of the Passion period on the words of the Gospel on Sunday Estomihi: Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, etc., one can treat the theme: Christians as fellow-sufferers in the passion and glory of Christ. From the Epistle on the 3rd Sunday, A.D., we may introduce: Our humbling under the mighty hand of God, and God's exaltation in His time. - Even if a funeral sermon were to contain a repetition of a sermon heard shortly before, this would be an opportunity for a listener eager for salvation to imprint the word already heard more deeply on his heart, even in times of mourning, since only temptation teaches us to remember the word, Isaiah 28:19.

Besides the ecclesiastical times, the circumstances of the life and other relations of the deceased are to be considered in order to locate a puffing text. I will give some examples. First, consider whether the deceased, as far as one can judge from his confession in words and works, proved himself to be a righteous Christian in his life, on his sickbed, and near death or not, whether he died quickly or had an accident, whether he was old and well aged, whether he died in youth or as a child, whether he lived in marriage and parenthood, or otherwise held an office. The more such relationships coincide, the more difficult the choice of text becomes; one searches and searches for a puffing text and yet finds none. In this case, one must make a selection, holding on to the most important and setting aside the others, and in relation to the former, choose the most suitable of a number of texts.

I will add two examples to explain. A father dies, a widower. He leaves behind several children, among them also some still uneducated ones, who inherit a not insignificant fortune. Here one could choose the saying Ephes. 3, 14-15 and derive from it the comfort of believing Christians that God is the true father. Especially dying fathers and mourning children should hold to this comfort. Another case: The deceased is a pious mother, a widow, in the house of one of her daughters, to whom she gave advice, help and comfort. As a text one could choose the word of the Lord Is. 66, 13. and emphasize two things from it.

1. Sweet is a mother's comfort, but sweeter still is God's comfort;
2. If our mother's comfort leaves us, God's comfort remains.

Some young preachers will object that every new choice of text will lead to a new textual torment, which will increase greatly because of the lack of practice and because of the pressure of work and time. I would like to refer to Luther's process. He, who knew almost the entire Bible by heart, could certainly have chosen a very specific text for the death of two Electors, e.g. David's Regency Mirror in the 101st Psalm; but what did he do? He chose a very general text on which he could have preached a funeral sermon to the least godly subject. Do we need to be ashamed if we do the same and, where we do not succeed in finding a specific text, resort to a general one without much hesitation?

With regard to the praise and censure of the deceased, one should beware of choosing such a text which contains one of the two without the necessary justification and which could be regarded as a judgment and verdict of God.

In the speech itself avoid too much praise and too much blame. If the deceased is singled out with denial of the truth as if

he had been a living saint, this pleases the relatives, of course, but others, who knew the deceased better than the preacher, take justified offence at it, because they find the statement confirmed anew: Funeral sermons, sermons of lies.

If, on the other hand, the deceased is rebuked too severely without due cause, a certain bitterness arises among the listeners, and the salutary impression of the speech is completely lost. Therefore, one should always remember that funeral orations do not apply to the dead, but to the living.

In the case of those who have died in their sins, the necessary word of punishment should be combined with heartfelt regret for the sinner and with salutary warnings for those present. In the case of those who, as we may hope, have fallen asleep in the Lord, one should follow the example of Dr. Luther in the funeral sermons just mentioned. In them he praises the high merits of both Electors, but does not conceal their natural sinfulness. In doing so, he testifies that those excellencies were worked by the grace of God alone, but that the same grace also covered all their weaknesses and infirmities, which is why they did not enter heaven because of their good works, but they were also not excluded from it because of their sins.

Sometimes a preacher is tempted to attribute to the bereaved a love for the deceased and a grief over his departure of which they know nothing. In this case, it is most advisable to show how, for example, spouses, how children should love and value their parents, and so on.

In the case of children's corpses, among the reasons for consolation, it is often emphasized that God has freed the child from all dangers of body and soul through a blessed death and has brought it into eternal safety, Weish. 4, 7-14. 4:7-14. But this consolation often does not stick, because many questions arise, e.g. why did God not also take away others in their childhood who later fell into bad ways? If God had taken away all children at an early age, where would the Church of God have remained, where could we have found it? Can God not keep children and adults in his grace, since he has promised all his faithful to carry out the good work begun in them until the day of Jesus Christ?

The Christian's highest consolation is the faith that God makes all things well, and the hope of eternal life.

Miscellencies.

Church Council**.** A certain firmness of doctrine is not at all un-American. How decidedly the Calvinist professes here the doctrine of absolute predestination, the Methodist the doctrine of full-

the Episcopalian to the doctrine of the divine institution of an episcopate above the presbyterate, the Baptist to the doctrine of the sole validity of adult baptism! Hardly can a Lutheran stand more firmly by the truth than the aforementioned stand by these errors of theirs. And everyone finds that quite all right in America, too. Only that is un-American, to make fraternal, or ecclesiastical, or sacramental, or finally even cultic fellowship dependent on the doctrines of distinction. It is rather American to regard every "denomination" as an "evangelical," probably also "orthodox," which among the fundamental articles presupposes the primary ones, within which therefore Christians can still be, inconsistently, however, with the exception of the Roman Church. (A discord in the American ecclesiastical harmony is therefore already the procedure of the Episcopalians and Baptists, of whom the former reject both pulpit - and sacrament - fellowship, and the latter at least this, with members of other denominations). From this it may be seen that it is the American spirit to recognize the right of individual conviction, and it is from this, and not from obedience to God's word, nor from faith in the importance of pure doctrine for the salvation of souls, that the adherence and relative assertion of the doctrines of distinction arise. The difference in doctrine between the various denominations is regarded as different subjective convictions, to which every man of character, if such a conviction is peculiar to him, must adhere, and which in turn must be respected in him. The existing difference of faith and doctrine does not, according to the American spirit, affect the brotherly relationship in which one is conscious of standing, if only, as has been said, the difference does not refer to certain primary fundamental articles, without which the origin of the saving faith is absolutely impossible, and if the confessor is only not within the Roman church. Now all this, of course, is not the Lutheran spirit. Even this does not deny that even among the sects where the primary articles of faith are still recognized, there are children of God, brethren in the faith, blessed ones; but to the Lutheran spirit this is an object of faith. In order to deal with any particular individual in a brotherly way of faith and to cultivate with him fellowship in cult, sacrament, and pulpit, that is, confessional fellowship, unity in all articles of faith is necessary to him, so that he does not confess error and become complicit in the harm to his soul of which false teaching is always the fruit, so that he may give glory to God, be obedient to the divine command to depart from those who teach differently, and bring those who err to the awareness of their dangerous error. This Lutheran spirit, therefore, does not yet permit even those Lutherans who cling to the confession of their Church with heart and clear consciousness to join the *Church Council.* In the latter, the American religious and ecclesiastical spirit has evidently taken the place of the Lutheran spirit.

Spirit prevails. We are far from it, when the chief leaders of the *Church Council* decisively profess their doctrinal creed, and yet at the same time want to and have to maintain American church practice, to openly and honestly confess that we therefore regard them as dishonest, two-faced men; The fact that they act according to their conscience and do not go beyond their convictions demands from us a certain respect for them, a greater respect than for those who, without a Lutheran spirit, want to have the old Lutheran practice followed only out of church politics, with regard to communion in faith, sacraments, pulpit and cult. But we cannot acknowledge a Lutheran spirit in those either. Rather, we believe that the American spirit, which is still powerful in them, does not at present permit them to make the confession of the Lutheran Church their own. A prominent example of this is Dr. Krotel in New York. In the February 15 issue of "The Lutheran" an unnamed person from the *Church Council* reported that he had held "Christmas services together with a dear brother from the strictly Calvinistic Dutch Reformed Church" and had practiced pulpit fellowship. *Insulanus" refers to* this report in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" of March 18, in a letter from New York, from which we report the following: "On Christmas Eve Dr. Thompson" (of the "*Dutch Reformed congregation*") came to the local where Krotel holds his services and which is the property of the congregation of the former, "to witness the children's Christmas celebration, and -Pastor Toad? invited him to appear in his coat on the altar place (*chancel*) the next morning and hold the altar service according to our '*Church-Book'.*" This was done. "Now if the member of a congregation belonging to the *Church Council,* and the 'Lutheran^ thinks this was an un-Lutheran and Unionist proceeding, they are perfectly at liberty to do so; but as to 'Pastor Toad? I know him well enough to be able to say that he would have considered it a dishonor to his Lutheranism and Christianity if he had said to the pastor and the members of this Reformed congregation: -No, you cannot unite with us in the celebration of the birth of our common Lord and Savior JEsu Christ'. I may well add, that both pastors and congregations felt happy, notwithstanding their differences on other points, to be able to come together and consider with devout thanksgiving a subject which both would have treated in the same spirit." (Should, then, Mr. vr. Krotel treat the Incarnation of God in the same spirit as a Calvinist who thinks of it Nestorianly and teaches to the dishonor of eternal love that God's Son came into the world only for the absolutely elect, to seek them and make them blessed?!) *Insulanus* continues: "Pastor Toad? would probably concede that these Dutch Reformed brethren would be more against him and his congregation.

I have not written this to justify him, but simply to give the real facts of the case, without showing how quick some persons are to snatch at every little thing. I have not written this to justify him, but simply to give the real facts of the case, and to show how quick some persons are to pick at every little thing which is thought to make the orthodoxy and consistency doubtful. The pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity The pastor of Holy Trinity Church has never stood, in or out of General Council, in writing or orally, to insist upon his right to let any evangelical man, whom he is persuaded will preach on the subject of which he is to preach to his congregation, in accordance with the Scriptures and our creeds, on a fine pulpit. He believes that there are many very precious doctrines and duties which one who is not in the Lutheran ministry may present scripturally, and he will preserve his right to invite such a one whenever he pleases, just as he would bear testimony of Christ on the pulpit of many another denomination which he could enter with a good conscience. If the *General Council* or Synod to which he belongs should command him to exclude from his pulpit all who are not Lutherans, he would probably act according to the principle which was pronounced by the Lutherans before Luther, namely by Peter and the other apostles, who said: This is what we call the American spirit, which has penetrated into the Lutheran Church under the influence of the Calvinism that prevails everywhere, and which cannot recognize the duty of leaving the confession of right doctrine unimpaired and unweakened, even by preserving the ecclesiastical boundaries, and which recognizes still less how a little leaven of false doctrine leavened the whole system. We repeat again, however, that we have made this remark in no unkind spirit against Dr. Krotel, a principal leader in the *Church Council*, and his comrades, and that far be it from us to hunt for "trifles" to make doubtful, against the truth, the orthodoxy and consistency of such men. We are rather pleased that Dr. Krotel defines his position so openly and honestly, and does not, as happens from other quarters, seek to cover up the present difference or even to disputate it away altogether. This way is the only way to mutual understanding and trust, and also to honest struggle, but to such a struggle that can only lead to true unity through God's grace. By the way, we are already rejoicing over every symptom, however slight it may seem, that the Lutheran spirit is already breaking through more and more in the *Church Council.* W.

Litterary Intelligences.

A new practical Hebrew Grammar by Salomon Deutsch. New York. 1868. 8.

While Germany sighs under the confusion which the equally nonsensical and presumptuous expositions of the well-known Ewald have wrought in Hebrew linguistics, America soberly and unflinchingly goes its own way. A proof of this is also afforded by this grammar. The author is evidently better acquainted with the Hebrew language than Mr. Roediger. His paradigms are more complete and more correct. The doctrine of the three tenses developed by him is correct except for a few minor points in § 107. We can therefore recommend the book with a clear conscience to those who do not wish to read Abul Walid and David Kimchi themselves.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

Christ and Sin. In the "Evangelist", an organ of the Reformed, of March 10, there is an essay on the question whether for Jesus there was a possibility of sinning. The writer answers this question in the affirmative! This affirmative is, of course, quite consistent with the Nestorian doctrine of the Reformirtes concerning Christ's person. W.

Usury. In Brobst's Monatshefte we find the beginning of an Iowa paper, in which the refutation of Luther's doctrine of usury seems to be attempted on the basis of the doctrine of Christian liberty and of love, as the summa of the unifying law in the New Testament alone. As to the latter doctrines, the exposition, rightly meant and rightly understood, is quite good; though the gentlemen of Iowa will not suppose to surprise us with it, as they have evidently read our exposition of the same doctrine on another occasion. But it is a pity, at any rate, that the gentlemen of Iowa, if, as it seems, they reject Luther's doctrine as a law-abiding one, did not live in Luther's time. They would then, no doubt, also have cured Luther of his "legal atrophy of Christianity," and taught him the right doctrine of the law, of the distinction of the Old and New Covenants, of love and Christian liberty. But let us moderate ourselves; perhaps the best will come only in the following numbers of the "Monatshefte." At least it would be nothing new with the gentlemen of Iowa that, on the basis of their Yes and No theology, the paper would conclude with the opening that they, too, agreed nothing the less in the doctrine of usury with the two greatest theologians of our church, with the two Martinuses. But then we beg you readers to regard the foregoing as unwritten, and to pardon the gentlemen of Iowa in advance, ready for any further retraction, however humiliating. W.

The gymnasts and Karl Vogt. The "Suburb of the North American Gymnastics Federation in New York" has sent a letter to the St. Louis Gymnastics Association on February 14, in which it reports that Prof. K. Bogt wants to come to America for a fee of §10,000 gold, half of which must be deposited in Geneva four weeks before his departure; in addition, the Gymnastics Federation will have to pay all travel and accommodation expenses, which are to be calculated at about $3,000 gold. In return, Vogt would give six lectures in each of seven of the most important cities, namely, in the opinion of the suburb, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago and

Milwaukee. These would therefore have to guarantee the amount of approximately $20,000 currency by subscription, with the understanding that a proportionate part of the subscribed sum would already have to be drawn in the course of the next autumn in order to be able to make the first payment to K. Vogt. It therefore goes without saying that every sum subscribed must be as good as *cash.* Should the costs not be fully covered by the entrance fee to be raised, the deficit would have to be borne by the guarantors in proportion to the guaranteed sum. Thus we have herewith a small sample of the willingness of the gymnasts to make sacrifices for "educational purposes". There is no doubt that the German-American youth, so much in need of education, will gladly make the required sacrifice. At any rate, they realize vividly that it is worth $20,600 among brothers when, on the path taken, even the hitherto most uneducated learns to see that we human beings are not, as Paul and almost 600 years before him the philosopher Pythagoras and almost 300 years before that the poet Aratus and philosopher Kleanthes maintained, of divine gender, but descended from an extinct species of apes. Who should not rejoice when it can be conclusively proved that man at least certainly did not descend from a certain other species of animals, the characteristic feature of which, as is well known, is an abnormal length of the ears? W.

The National Reform Convention. Of this the "***Lutheran Standard***" of Feb. 15, reports as follows: "The General Convention, called by the National Reform Society, to consider the claims of God and the Christian religion upon our State and Nation, assembled in the Town-street Methodist Church at Columbus, O., Tuesday, Feb. 2. A considerable number of delegates, or friends of the cause, from different parts of the country, were present, and much was said on the subject of the evil of Christianity not being recognized in our Constitution. It was agreed: Resolved, That we hold the following principles to be in accordance with Scripture and sound reason: 1. The civil government is a divine order. The State has its origin in the will and ordinance of God, and from him are established its institutions and powers. 2. (2) Nations are moral persons and bound by the moral law. The commonwealth exercises a moral power, and serves moral as well as material ends, similar to those of the family; and like the family, a nation may and ought also to honor God. (3) God has revealed himself to the world through Christ, and made him the supreme ruler of nations; through him national homage should be paid, national blessings sought, and national sins forgiven. 4. Scripture, as a revelation of the will of God to men, to guide them in all the circumstances of life, is the supreme authority with which all human constitutions should agree in their moral principles. - The great moral truths contained in these propositions are not recognized in that otherwise noble instrument, the Constitution of the United States. As we earnestly apprehend, they can no longer be omitted without danger to all those interests which the government was founded to protect, and which are so dear to every patriot. The recognition of these truths on the part of the State does not require the adoption of any denominational faith, nor the participation in any particular religious cult as a qualification to office, nor does it limit the liberty of conscience, nor does it seek a union of Church and State which would corrupt both and frustrate the highest purposes of both. - The abstention of these reformers is doubtless without good, but the thought of making Christians by an amendment to the Constitution, or of improving our national condition by the interposition of a few pious words, does not commend itself to our minds." - Nor, of course, does it commend itself to ours. C.

The death penalty, which was abolished by law in the State of Illinois in 1867, was reinstated by the legislature on Feb. 19 of this year, on account of the perception that murders had increased at an alarming rate as a result of this abolition.

The Lutheran Observer on Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Articles. In its numbers of March 12 and 19, the Observer states: "The doctrinal basis of the General Synod calls for the acceptance of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God as taught in the Augsburg Confession. Confession. But it has never determined which doctrines it regards as fundamental and which not. In former times it was content with the general judgment of the Protestant world concerning the fundamental articles of Christianity. Until recent times, no difficulties arose because of this non-enumeration of the fundamental doctrines. But during the last ten years the question, "What is fundamental?" has been widely discussed, and so Divine Providence calls upon us to give special attention to this question. We see no reason why the General Synod should not have its foundation laid by a definition of the Fundamental Articles of the Augsb. Confession and by a brief enumeration of them. The Pennsylvania Synod also confessed in 1852, 'We all agree in the essential fundamental doctrines of our mother Lutheran Church,' and on its reunion with the General Synod in 1853, it recognized the same as a 'union of Lutheran Synods alone, holding the same views of the fundamental doctrines of Scripture.' But recently it declared all doctrines in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession to be fundamental. Confession as fundamental, and in the adoption and acceptance of the fundamental principles of the ***General Council,*** it theoretically took a still more extreme and untenable position with regard to the confessional requirements for synodical union. But compelled to carry out this new theory practically at Fort Wayne and Pittsburg, she found herself obliged to ignore it, and in the speeches of her delegates, and in the proceedings of the ***Council*** over the four points, which she presided over, she gave indirect testimony to the correctness of her former principles on fundamental articles. Among other things, he says: "According to the general judgment of the Church" (?)" the differences of opinion about certain views of doctrine, by which the Orthodox-Protestant churches differ from each other, do not belong to the fundamental, but to the m'chtfundamental doctrines. Whether the election of God's grace be absolute or conditional; whether corruption in Adam's fallen nature be simply propagated, or only the guilt of his sin imputed to his posterity; whether the atonement be general or confined to the elect; whether justification be effected by imputing Christ's righteousness to the believer, or by imputing his faith (as virtue?); whether the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is bodily or spiritual, whether the reception of his body and blood is by faith or by mouth, whether it is limited to believers or extended to unbelievers; whether the laity participate in the government of the church, or whether the exercise of all its powers is limited to preachers; whether the Scriptural principles establish an ecclesiastical hierarchy or democracy - these and many other questions are answered differently by the various Protestant denominations, but without this objectively embracing the ground of faith or subjectively the essence of faith. In other words, these questions may be answered differently, without any man's orthodoxy suffering thereby, or his 'hope of salvation being soured. In short, the doctrinal views which now still divide the Protestant churches are non-fundamental." Well, add that to your doctrinal basis as an addition, and the union on the broadest basis will be complete, and you will still be called Lutheran like ***lucus a non lucendo***. C.

The "*Evangelical Lutheran*" on and against the "*Lutheran and Visitor*". In its number of March 4, the "k!v2ir§eUcs1 Dutüerau" counters a Correspondent of the "***Lutheran and Visitor,*" *who*** recommends the same to Southern Lutherans, as follows: "That the church of the South is in a state of transition, and is making some progress in regaining the faith 'once given to the saints,' even the most superficial observer can well see; but

It is equally evident that it has not yet reached this goal. Many of our preachers have not yet made the special, distinguishing doctrines of the Lutheran Church the object of serious and diligent study; have not yet recognized the necessity and importance of searching for 'the old paths of the good way,' and consequently are not yet enlightened and grounded in regard to the excellence and value of the glorious heritage of the Lutheran Church.They are therefore not yet enlightened and grounded in the excellence and value of the glorious heritage of the Lutheran Church, nor are they armed against the subtle and apparent influences that take hold of them to entice them to the unconfessional sects or presumptuous denominations by which they are surrounded, or to mislead them into believing that the Lutheran Confession is an outmoded thing that needs to be transformed in order to make it contemporary and in harmony with Scripture. So it is with our church in the South. Now what has the "***Lutheran and Visitor***," this "true Lutheran," done to instruct our people and to teach them about the special character of the church of the Augsburg Confession? Confession? Nothing, comparatively nothing. He has hitherto brought little, very little that is distinctively Lutheran. The great reproach against the paper is that it is not a distinctly Lutheran paper. It gives no clear distinctive tone of itself. What appears in its columns might as well be published in a Methodist or Presbyterian paper without giving the least offence to the choosiest reader. This peculiarity of the paper is most probably the reason why Mr. Correspondent is so fond of it. Has he perhaps once been an advocate of elective affinities? We have been much affected to find that the paper has assumed a false position, inconsistent with the claims and promises of those who have undertaken to stand at its helm, and guide it safely through the dangers which may threaten even its existence. It promised to be distinctively Lutheran, but has failed to meet the expectations of the church at large on this point. " C.

Iowa Correspondences. Since Prof. Fritschel is a correspondent of Luthardt's "Evangelical Lutheran Church Newspaper" published in Leipzig, it will not be incorrect to assume that he is also the author of the report on the general church meeting of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Pittsburg, which appeared in No. 6 of that magazine. In this report, the correspondent tells the German audience, among other things, that of all the delegates who represented the stricter direction at the meeting, none approved of the assertion of the Missouri Synod at the meeting in Adrian in 1867: that the body and blood of Christ should not be present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper in a Lutheran Synod in which there is still unchristian practice. The Correspondent states exactly where the sentence is to be found, namely, in the Synodal Report of the Northern District, A. D. 1867, p. 52, and adds that this assertion was made with reference to the Wisconsin Synod. But the very next year, at the meeting of the Northern District of the Missouri Synod at Milwaukee, June 13, 1868, the above assertion was retracted, and the erroneous inclusion of the same in the report of 1867 was proved. The words of this report on p. 28 thus read, "On motion, a statement was made concerning a passage in the previous Synodal Report p. 52: 'on the question: whether a Synod with Unirt practice in the Lord's Supper also had the body and blood of Christ,' etc.,. It was remarked that the expression: "Synod with Uniate Practice" instead of "Uniate Synod" had been used by mistake. It was further declared, 1. That though the existence of the Sacrament in Unirte communities had been spoken of on the occasion of the proceedings concerning the Wisconsin Synod, it had not been decided with reference to the Wisconsin Synod. (2) Something has been said by individuals in regard to the doctrine here expressed, but it has not been laid down as the conviction of the Synod." Why might not the Correspondent have told the German public something of this correction? Yes, why?!

The statistical on ecclesiastical communities in America, which "The Christian Messenger" of March 10 gives from Schem's "American, ***Ecclesiastical and Educational Almanac*** for 1869, is this: The United States has

a population of 34,560,000, of whom 5,000,000 are Roman Catholics, 27,000,000 Protestants, and 10,000 (in Alaska) of the Greek Church. Of the Protestant Christians, the Episcopalians have 43 dioceses, 49 bishops, 2736 preachers, 2472 ecclesiastical parishes, and 194,692 communicants. - The Presbyterians of the Ver. States were divided into ten bodies. The Old School Presbyterians have 26 Synods, 142 Presbyteries, 2737 Churches, 2330 Preachers, 223 Licentiate, and 252,555 Communicants. The New School Presbyterians have 111 presbyteries, 1590 churches, 1800 preachers, 121 licentiates, 290 candidates for the ministry, and 168,932 communicants. The United Presbyterians have 54 presbyteries, 401 preachers, and 65,612 members. The PresbyterianChurch of the South has 10 synods, 48 presbyteries, 786 preachers, 51 licentiates, 92 candidates, 1298 churches, and 70,949 communicants. The Cumberland Presbyterians have 24 synods, 99 presbyteries, 1500 preachers, and 130,000 communicants. - The Reformed Presbyterian Church (Old School) has 77 preachers and 8487 communicants. The Associate Synod of North America consists of 4 presbyteries, 12 preachers, 40 congregations, and 1091 members. The Associate Reformed Synod of New-York consists of 16 preachers and 1631 members. The Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (South) has 68 preachers (number of members not given), and the Ref. Presbyterian Synod has 63 preachers and 5821 members - making a total of 7053 preachers and 704,778 members of Presbyterian churches. - There are ten Methodist bodies in the Ver. States. The Episcopal Meth. church has 848l traveling preachers (departed, etc., included), 9899 local preachers, and 1, 255, 115 members, of whom 194,850 are probationary members. The southern Episc. Meth. church has 2581 traveling preachers, 3952 local preachers, and 535,040 full and probationary members. The Meth. Prot. church (southern) has about 72,000 members. The Methodist Church has 624 traveling and 444 local preachers, with about 50,000 members. The Wesleyan connection has about 15,000 members. The Evangelical Fellowship has 500 traveling preachers and 64,814 full and probationary members. The African Episc. Meth. Church has 600 traveling preachers and 2tX),000 members. The African Episc. Meth. Zion Church has 694 preachers and 164,000 members. The Free Meth. churches have 94 churches and about 6000 members. The Primitive Methodists have about 20 traveling preachers and 2000 members. - Sum total of all divisions of Methodism, so far as stated; 13,594 traveling preachers and 2,363,969 members. - The Regular Baptists in the Der. States have 8346 preachers and 1,094,806 members, The Freewill Baptists have 1161 ordained preachers and 61, 244 members. The other Baptist denominations report about 4000 preachers and 707,956 members - a total of 13,507 Baptist preachers and 1,864,006 members. - The Longregationalists have 3070 preachers and 296,674 members. - The Lutheran Church in America has 1792 preachers and 350,088 communicants. - The Reformed Prot. Church has 469 Licentiate and 59,508 members. - The German Reformed Church has 505 preachers and 115,483 members. - The United Brethren number 868 traveling preachers, 783 local preachers, and 108, 122 members. - The Herrnhuter have 66 preachers and 6656 communicants. - The Universalists have 588 preachers and 792 churches. - The Unitariancr have 383 preachers and 315 societies. - The Church of New Jerusalem has 64 preachers and licentiates and 3659 members. - The "Church of God" (Weinbrenner) numbers about 26,000 members and 350 licensed preachers. The other denominations in the United States are: the Quakers, the Shakers, the Adventists, the River Brethren, the Bible Christians, the Jrvingites (Catholic Apostolic Church), the Jews, the Mormons (about 60,000) and the Onelda-Communists. These statistics do not enumerate all the church constitutions in the United States. The "German Temple," which has an organ in the "Reichsposaune," and other church denominations are not named. The "United Brethren in Christ" are not listed among the Methodist church bodies; whether this was done because some of their leaders protested against such a classification earlier, we cannot say. In doctrine and operation, however, it should hardly be possible to prove a difference between this church body and the Methodist family.

In the Louisville **"Catholic Messenger of Faith" of** March 17, be-

Recently the Holy Father was informed that the bishops of Hungary had discussed what should be done to the Holy Father. The bishops of Hungary have discussed what should be given to the Holy Father for the celebration of the 11th anniversary of his death. Father for the celebration of the 11th. One had suggested a magnificent chalice, another something else. Then one of the reverend gentlemen said: He knows the Holy Father. If you give him something, he will give it to someone else after a few days. One could not do him a better service than to send him money so that he could use it as he saw fit.' (As if Mr. Pius could not also give the money away, if he is such a generous gentleman.') "The holy father then remarked: 'This bishop has given away money to someone else. The holy father remarked: 'This bishop has had a good idea, so far as his Eminence is concerned. Let us be told that." Here we are again reminded of the well-known verse from a poem by Baptista Mantuanus, General of the Carmelite Order of Mantua, who died on March 20, 1518, in which he sings of the Papal Church:

---- Venalia nobig

Templa, sacerdotes, altaria, sacra, coronae, Ignis, thura, preces, coelum venale, Deusque. W.

II. Abroad.

Heaven. In this year's preface to the Evangelical Church Newspaper, Hengstenberg seeks to lift the doubts of the unbelieving naturalists against the Holy Scriptures. In this year's Evangelical Church Journal, Hengstenberg seeks to overcome the objections of unbelieving naturalists to the Holy Scriptures, that they portray the earth as the main body of the world. Hengstenberg knows how to support the unbelieving naturalists against the Scriptures, that they represent the earth as the main body of the world. Hengstenberg knows how to draw on so many passages of Scripture to support this sweet dream that even a believer in the Bible will be moved to indulge in a few minutes of rapture with him. Passages, of course, such as Matt. 24:35: "Heaven and earth shall pass away." V. 29. "The stars shall fall from heaven." 2 Pet. 3, 10. ff: "But the day of the Lord shall come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise.... In which the heavens shall pass away with fire . . But we wait for a new heaven and a new earth, according to his promise, in which righteousness dwells" - Hengstenberg does not quote. For as soon as he would remember such passages, he would fall rudely from his clouds to the earth and awake from his dream. W.

Sumpiskopat der Lan-esherrn. From Hesse-Darmstadt one also writes to the "Ev.-Luth. Kz: The Mitzenius deal is without doubt an event of great consequence for the entire German Protestant Church. It seems that through it a question must be brought to a head, which in church practice, here and there even in theory, lies deeply in trouble, and urgently needs clarification. It is the question of the nature and extent of the sovereign powers of the Protestant Church, and the decision on this question has indeed become a most urgent one, especially after the Mitzenius case, in which the Protestant sovereign unanimously passed a resolution by the Oberconsistorium, the Superintendents, the Oberstudiendirektion, and the Evangelische Landesherr, the Superintendents, the Directorate of Higher Education, and the State Ministry, and decided that this person was to be reprimanded (thus very mildly) and left undisturbed in his office, not because of the content, but merely "because of the improper form of his writing. This question, however, must be brought to a head, if the church is not to be made into that famous all-world church of free congregations, where no faith, no confession, and no dogma are any longer valid. These thoughts, therefore, rightly move all positive-minded clergy with the seriousness appropriate to the situation.

In the hall of the Berlin Craftsmen's Association, Prof. Virchow recently gave a lecture on "Ape and Human Skulls" for the trade associations. The learned speaker countered the theories of his friend Karl Vogt, according to which the human race originated from apes and could degenerate into apes, with thorough treatises on the spinal column and based on this the right of the human race to a higher position in creation. (N. W.)

Union. With obvious satisfaction Hengstenberg writes in the preface to the Ev. Kz. s. e.: "The Lutheran Church Newspaper published in Leipzig (by Luthardt) has agreed to the program of the Ev. K. Z. and thus eliminated the doubt as to whether the Lutherans in the new provinces will not protest against any participation in the Union. But Hengstenberg states as his program: "Confederative Union, continuance of the uniform church regiment, but threefold division of the same. " W.

Lutheran Response to the Pope's Admonition. Pastor v. Kienbusch wrote in the "Immanuel" of February 1: "We already have the answer ready with ecclesiastical approval. Let us send the Pope a copy of the Schmalkalden articles as our heartfelt conviction. We can add nothing more comforting than this, for example, that the Lutheran Church still holds to the statement that the pope is the right end-Christian with the "Schmalkalder," but does not therefore declare those who consider the pope to be only anti-Christian to be aberrations." But surely for those who have gone astray? - And that alone is what we also want. W.

"A Word for the Struggle." Under this heading there is an essay in the Erlanger Zeitschrift (January issue a. c.), which shows that it is becoming more and more clear in Germany what a decisive time is dawning for the Lutherans there. It says, among other things, "We think that God has something new in mind for our church. For a long time we have deliberated about church and church office, about the best church constitution, about state and church, about confession and union, about regional churches and separation: nothing new has come out of it. The children came up to birth, but there was no strength to give birth. Each one stood on his "standpoint" and looked to his own way; and over this we became a herd that scattered without a shepherd. But now it seems that according to God's will things are to be different, for he has spoken to us with deeds and is still speaking. He brings us into a crisis, where we must decide, whether to live or to die.... Unfortunately, things are not in such a way that we only need to be on the defensive in order to preserve this supplement of ours. The Lutheran churches in the Prussian state and in the North German Confederation in general have been brought into the position that it is a matter of an either-or: either they gradually fall victim to the union as it prevails in the old Prussian provinces, or this union finds in those churches the cornerstone on which it breaks. If there were truth in the phrase of the day about the independence of the churches and the freedom of religious practice, one might expect that what does not want to stay together would come to terms peacefully and differently. But in order to destroy these illusions, it did not even require the last chamber negotiations in Berlin; and that on the part of the government no encouragement will be given to peaceful debate is equally beyond doubt. Thus, then, the continuance of the Union in its present form is our death, and if we wish to live we must act aggressively against it. It is the duty of the Lutheran brethren in the Union to stand faithfully by those in the New Prussian lands in this offensive. The moment has come when they must prove that they were serious in their struggle for the right and the existence of the Lutheran Church in Prussia. '" W.

Prussian grammar schools. Of them Hengstenberg says: "Christian parents who are directed to a certain grammar school only too often have cause for the painful complaint that what they had built up with God's help is wantonly destroyed there in their children. In Berlin, too, such parents are relieved of a heavy burden when they have first brought their sons happily through the Gymnasium." Oh that we here in America would realize what a great grace God has done for us in this respect, too! W. .

Altenburg. Here the Ministry has submitted a draft law to the Landtag, according to which the church there is to be incorporated into the state, as in Prussia in 1808.

In Bavaria, a Jew has recently been appointed for the first time as a full professor at a university in the country. Prof. Dr. Jacob Herz, who is known as an outstanding scholar in his field, has been appointed full professor of anatomy at the University of Erlangen. (Ref. Kz.)

America and Russia. From St. Petersburg it is written: The proofs of friendship and understanding exchanged between America and Russia have for years seemed incomprehensible, even to our Russians and Slavophiles. But now a circumstance has arisen by which especially the orthodox Russians feel themselves injured. In the corresponding organs, the glorification of the sale of Russian-American possessions to the United States has been silent ever since the constitution of the republic came into force in those transatlantic landscapes. Formerly, in Asia as in America, the Popes, for a handful of tobacco, sugar, even a mirror, converted numerous heathens by sprinkling and blessing them, and then forced them to pay penalties to the clergy if they did not come to confession. Such was the procedure with the Kuriles, Aleuts, and Eskimos. Since these countries have been sold to the American Republic, which does not recognize any rule of the Church, these conditions have changed. The bishops and the rest of the clergy were left to their fate, and the people, freed from the Russian bureaucracy, ceased to pay money to the clergy, who in their turn knocked violently at the holy Synod here. The Holy Synod decided: the Orthodox clergy must remain under Russian protection, jurisdiction and solde. The differences which probably arose from this between the republic and the Russian government are already giving rise to complaints from the Slavophiles about the sale which took place, although at first they applauded it.. .. (Ref. Kz.)

The conditional exemption from military service for students of theology and candidates for the Catholic priesthood will cease in Prussia and all states of the North German Confederation at the end of the year 1869. - In Denmark, the committee set up by the two Houses of Parliament decided by a majority vote at its meeting of January 12 in favor of the proposal that those clergymen who are ordained in the Danish People's Kitchen be exempt from service in the reinforcements and be struck off the army list in peacetime if they have served six years in the line.

(Ref. Kz.)

Progress of Methodism in Germany. On January 17, the new building of the so-called "Martin Missions-Anstalt" was opened in Frankfurt. "Martin Missions-Anstalt, an institute founded "through the splendid liberality" of Mr. Martin, the warm friend of German Methodism, and transferred from Bremen to Frankfurt a. M., for the "efficient training of such young men as have a call from God and the church to the preaching ministry.... inaugurated. The "Apologist" remarks: "The brothers and sisters on this side - look full of hope to that school of education, from which many a brave missionary will go forth to show the Theures in their dear homeland the way to the Father's house." - Also in Pforzheim, Grand Duchy of Baden, a Methodist church was built together with a priest's residence. R.

In Catholic circles one hurries to send to the Pope for his "50th anniversary as a priest" on April 10 of this year addresses of devotion and above all "sounding coins". In order to make his "faithful" all the more willing to give money, the well-known Bishop Martin of Paderborn indulges in long-winded praise of the Pope and remarks, among other things: "Behold, O good Father, worthy representative of the good Shepherd, we know that nothing is more dear to you than the salvation of immortal souls, and even for a single immortal soul that we save for you, you would give the whole world and, if you had the choice, even a thousand worlds. This may be true, so long as the souls saved to the pope lay the honors and treasures of this world most humbly at his feet. For the rest, the "good father" loves the world so much that he will not allow a piece of it to be taken away from him without repaying it with banishment and eight, and, if he had the choice, with a thousand hells. R.

The next Papal Council. Hengstenberg reports of this: "There is already talk that it is under discussion whether one should not proclaim the hitherto ecclesiastically released Assumption of Mary as dogma and thus provide new material for the hypocrisy, the impression of which is received by everyone who with an unbiased mind sees one of the

modern Catholic Marian sermons. From another side, work is being done to proclaim the infallibility of the Pope as a dogma, which the Pope himself, in a recent letter to Sicily, has most blatantly settled, and has called the doubt about it the outflow of a godless rationalism."

Father Roh once again. In the Ev. Kirchenzeitung we read: "One of the most common and most annoying accusations against the Order, which has to bear so heavily from its past, is that it teaches that the end justifies the means. In order to put an end to this accusation with one blow, Father Roh promised publicly from the pulpit to pay a thousand florins to whoever could prove that a Jesuit had established that principle. Judge should be the faculty of law in Heidelberg. Catholic newspapers triumphantly circulated this declaration, partly with a generous increase of the sum, which in the declaration of a Catholic clergyman in a Märkische Blatte (Königsberg in the N. M.) had even grown to 20,000 Thaler. A priest from Rheinbaiern appeared as applicant for the prize. One of the first Jesuit authorities, Busembaum, teaches in the ***theologia moralis***: 'It is also lawful, at least before the tribunal of conscience, to deceive the guardians, e. g. by giving them food or drink, or by putting them to sleep, or by taking precautions that they be absent; likewise also to break bands and chains, for if the end is lawful, so are the means', ***quia, cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita***. Here, it seems, there was no escape. And yet Father Roh knew how to help himself. His organ said that Busembaum understood by the means only good means, that the faculty of law in Heidelberg should be the judge, but that "the appeal to another faculty should be free," which had not been mentioned before, whereby probably Innsbruck was intended with its theological faculty consisting entirely of Jesuits. It almost seems that Father Roh wanted to earn the thousand florins himself. In any case he has shown that the principle: the end justifies the means, is still in force among the Jesuits. The supposedly good end, not to let Catholic church property come into Protestant hands, sanctifies with him the bad means of obviously futile evasions. Father Maurer has brought the matter before the public in the writing: 'Neuer Jesuitenspiegel', Mannheim 1868."

Even the pagans promise themselves good things from the next papal council. The Louisville Catholic Messenger of Faith of March 10 reports: "From Burma a letter has arrived at the Longregation of Propaganda from the well-known missionary Father Albona, by which he indicates that he has spoken with the pagan emperor of that country about the Council and has asked him not to put any difficulties in the way of the bishops who want to travel to Rome. 'Not only will I raise no difficulties against so good a work,' replied the heathen emperor, 'but I will facilitate the journey of the bishops by paying them the expenses of it. Also, if it can be done, I will send a golden cross to each bishop at the Conciliar." (Catholic princes can take an example from this!)"

Sects in Würtemberg. The relationship of the religious dissidents in Würtemberg is to be determined by the following bills: "The formation of religious associations outside the churches recognized by the state as public corporations is independent of prior state approval. These associations are entitled to the right of free common religious practice in domestic and public worship, as well as to the independent ordering and administration of their affairs. They may not, however, according to their creed, their constitution, and their effectiveness, conflict with the dictates of morality and with the public legal order. All regulations which are not in harmony with the present law and which have been in force since then are repealed. (Ref. Kz.)

The Methodists in Würtemberg. Concerning them Hengstenberg writes: "How is it possible that the Methodists can find such an important entrance in the church of Würtemberg, which in general is opposed to this community like the higher form of the lower? The clergy of Würtemberg takes a high level of education.

The Methodists' sends are uneducated people who have only a stock of stereotyped idioms at their disposal. The reports from Würtemberg in the American German organ of the Methodists, written by these sends, consistently bear the character of mindless monotony. The people of Würtemberg have a drive for knowledge like hardly any other German people. How can they take pleasure in repeating a few catchwords and shouting them? No effect without a cause. There must be some breach in the Würtemberger church, so blessed as it is, into which the enemy knows how to skillfully penetrate. It cannot be sought in the fact that in Würtemberg, as everywhere, there are dead, unfaithful, lazy clergymen. For the inclination to Methodism is not confined to the congregations of such clergymen. We find it rather in the fact that even by the believing clergy much is preached over their heads."

The sect of the German Temple (Chr. Hoffmann) began to carry out its plan of founding a city in Galilee last year. The originators of this fantastic plan are burdened with a heavy guilt. Many of the poor seduced Lenten have already been snatched away, probably few will even escape with their lives, and those who return to their homeland with a broken heart will be in danger of suffering shipwreck in their faith. (Ev. Kz.)

France and the Concil. The French. The French envoy in Rome is said to have received a dispatch for communication to the Secretary of State Antonelli, in which the French government expresses the hope that the ecumenical council will deal neither with the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope nor with the "organic articles," since both subjects are such that their discussion at the council could cause divisions in the empire and agitate the minds.

(Cath. Glbote.)

The Pope has decided to restore the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Scotland as well. The appointments concerning this will partly take place in the next secret Consistory. (Herald of the Gl.)

Jews in China. Before the American Society last week, Dr. Martin, formerly a Protestant missionary, and now professor of the Imperial Institute at Pekin, delivered a lecture on his journey from Pekin to Shanghai, which he undertook in the winter of 1866, to visit the colony of Jews on the Yellow River. When he entered a hospital in Hong-Kong, he said, he noticed a Hebrew inscription with the words, "Hear O Israel; the Lord thy God is one God." He made further inquiries, and then, as I have said, made the journey from Pekin, Dr. Martin found the place where the colony of Jews had been, by a ruined city, which formerly bore the name of Ki-Fung Fou, and which is said to have once been the capital of the Chinese empire. Now, in the place where the synagogue used to stand, there is only an old gateway and a stone with Jewish inscriptions, which say that two thousand years ago Jews came from India to China, settled there and built a synagogue. This fell into decay about 250 years ago, and as there was no rabbi, it was not rebuilt, and religion and language were forgotten. He still found an old Hebrew manuscript, which contained the first two books of Moses. This discovery is interesting enough to be worth spreading the knowledge of it. (N.-Y.-Journ.)

Italy. The total number of inhabitants of Rome at Easter last year was 2l7,378 souls. Among them were 29 cardinals, 28 bishops, 1371 priests, 799 ecclesiastical seminarians and collegians, 2947 monks, and 2l9l nuns. Including the pope, 7366 inhabitants of Rome belong to the "ecclesiastical" state, which is a little less than one-thirtieth of the population. Happy Rome! L.

Death. On 3 Feb. died in Göttingen ***the*** professor of philosophy Dr. ***Dr. theol. et phil***. Heinrich Ritter (b. 1791), the well-known author of the twelve-volume History of Philosophy (1829-1853).

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume XV. **May 1869.** **No. 5.**

Materialien zur Pastoraltheologie, mitgetheilt von C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 32. a.

The most important rules for pastoral visits to the sick are, according to our most experienced divine scholars, namely the following: "First, so that a church servant who is called upon to visit a sick person does not, as it were, attack the business with unwashed hands (as they say) or unformally, he can most easily begin with the patient with the saying Matth. 10:30, that our hairs on the head are all numbered, etc., and then report to the sick person that such an illness or whatever condition it may be has not been sent to him without our God's foreknowledge, but everything has been sent to him according to his counsel and will, and thereupon tell the sick person that such a disease, or whatever condition it may be, was not sent to him by chance, nor without the foreknowledge of our God, but all according to the counsel and will of him; which he should also accept, and put no doubt in his mind that if this disease were for life or for death, it would be for his good; if we only put ourselves right in it. After this follows a further account of what is the cause why God is wont to afflict us with sickness or such like conditions." (S. Felix Bidembach's, weil. Hofprediger zu Stuttgart, *Manuale ministrorum ecclesiae*, i. e. Handbook for the young aspiring church servants. 1603. S. 647.)

Annotation.

When visiting a sick person for the first time, the preacher must of course first address the members of the household who are receiving him and, after expressing his sympathy, immediately address to them a short word of admonition and, depending on the circumstances, of comfort, among other things also for the purpose of putting those who have to do with the sick person in the right frame of mind for him. When the preacher then approaches the sick person himself, he begins to communicate with him.

of course also first with a greeting, with assurance of his condolences and with sympathetic inquiries about the condition of the sufferer. Gottfried Olearius remarks on this: "Just as the clergyman, on entering a patient, is generally received and accepted by one of his neighbors, so too must the word of admonition and consolation first be spoken to them in order to promote their good dispositions, with which they can also in part benefit the sick person. This, however, must be done with the distinction between their good and bad conduct, in so far as it has been made known to the pastor. But when the doctor of the soul comes to the sick person himself, he will begin with a heartfelt greeting, in which he may either wish in general from him who is a God of life, light, help, and comfort, the necessary assistance for patience, recovery of the body, and sanctification of the soul, or he may arrange his greeting and wish in particular according to the circumstances of the time, only that he does not take too long with it. Then, with a brief expression of sympathy, and by inquiring about the patient's condition, he may himself give him material for conversation." (*Collegium pastorale* i. e. Instructions for the Spiritual Cure of the Soul. Leipz. 1718. 4. p. 839. ff.)

§ 32. b.

A second important rule is that the preacher, in order to make the right pastoral treatment of the patient, should make an exploration, according to the condition of the latter, which is less or more known to him.

Note 1.

Seidel rightly remarks: "The difference between the outward and especially the inward condition of the sick requires that a teacher especially investigate the condition of each sick person and perform his ministry with due prudence. It is easy to see that it is not appropriate to treat every sick person in the same way, and that it is not enough for the preacher to read to the sick person something from the church order, as is done in many places, but that a preacher must prove himself here as a physician who knows the illness of each person and knows how to prescribe the remedies for it." (Pastoral Theology. 1, 13, 2. p. 212. f.)

Note 2.

Olearius advises the preacher to investigate the following six things in particular: "1. Whether or not the sick person has acquired an adequate knowledge of the way to salvation. (2) Whether or not he has continued in the practice of this way all his life, or whether he has been unrepentant in public sins until his deathbed, or whether he has lived an outwardly blameless life.

But one cannot be quite sure that it was led by faith in true sanctification. 3. (3) In what particular profession he found himself, and to what temptations he was especially subjected after the same; likewise, what divine guidance, judgments of grace and wrath he experienced and was able to observe in such a state. (4) What form the disease takes; whether and when it permits much talking, questioning, and answering; whether it soon puts an end to it, or allows the patient some time to take care of himself and order his house; whether it leaves his head open and undisturbed, or not; and whether, therefore, his talking and movements are due to his disease or to the rational movements of his mind (which consideration is to be made especially in heated diseases). (5) The special (natural) dispositions of the patient are also to be taken into consideration (temperament and powers of comprehension). 6. it must also be observed what might arouse the patient's horror before death". (A. a. O. p. 809. ff.) To No. 2. it is also to be noted that the preacher is also to examine whether the sick person, if he bears the marks of a still unconverted person, is self-righteous and in carnal security, or whether he is in servile fear, and, if he has the marks of a true believing Christian, whether he is strong in faith, or weak, or challenged. It is especially important, especially in our day, that the preacher ascertain whether the sick person doubts the truth of the Word of God or of certain fundamental articles of the Christian faith.

Note 3.

The examination of the condition of the sick must not, of course, take place in an inquisitorial manner, but should be done in such a way that, on the one hand, the necessary information is obtained from the patient's behavior, and, on the other hand, the patient is induced indirectly to discover his condition voluntarily. Bidembach therefore writes only: "The church servant should also diligently pay attention to the speeches, gestures, and all actions of the sick person; from this he can inform himself to the best of his ability and take the opportunity to converse with him. (A. a. O. p. 648.)

§ 32. c.

A third rule is that the preacher should first take care of what is most necessary for the sick person according to his condition, without which everything else would be fruitless.

Annotation.

Olearius gives this rule, which is as simple as it is important. He writes: "The general rule remains that one should first seize what is most necessary and without which the other negotiations would be fruitless, and above all seek to arrive at correctness with it; e.g., one should first take the necessary and the necessary without which the other negotiations would be fruitless, and above all seek to arrive at correctness with it.

that if the patient is very ill-tempered, impatient, restless, and careless because of his illness, he should be made to be quiet, calm, and attentive, because without this all other talking and preaching would be in vain; that if it is noted that there is a lack of necessary instruction in what belongs to repentance, faith, and sanctification, he should first make an effort to give thorough instruction; that, if doubts should arise concerning essentials of religion, they should first of all be cleared away (as the true certainty that the Scriptures are the Word of God is lacking in many, indeed unfortunately in most, for the opinion they have of it is not a firm inner conviction; Therefore the divine origin and reputation of Scripture should be treated of more often than is done); that, when knowledge is good in theory, but in practice still lacks the knowledge of itself and righteous repentance, one should give the first instruction for this; that, when doubts should arise concerning the grace of God in Jesus Christ for these and those causes, this matter should be undertaken first," and so on. etc. (op. cit. p. 848. f.).

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

"What is fundamental in Christianity?"

This is the heading of XIX theses and a paper which Dr. Mann, Professor at the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia, wrote on behalf of the Synod of Pennsylvania and submitted for its consideration in the early year of 1868, and which was then published in the "Theologische Monatshefte", by Rev. Brobst in the October issue of 1868.

The good intention of the author to secure the entire revealed truths of the Christian faith and confession against the indifferentists and to assert them as inviolable cannot be denied, and in view of this good intention, the speaker could count on the attention and applause of all right Lutherans from the beginning, and could hardly wish for a more grateful topic. However, in spite of the good constellation and intention, the speaker, that we can only say right here, has solved his task very badly, and the reader will finally put the theses as well as the paper aside unsatisfied. For this article lacks clarity and consistency throughout; everything is so intermingled that one can hardly avoid a certain confusion that wants to creep up on one, and unfortunately there is no thread, neither golden nor linen, running through this chaotic labyrinth; but one comes into real embarrassment when, at the conclusion of the essay, one is supposed to say what, according to the author's opinion and outpouring, is actually fundamental in Christianity.

Let us now examine the paper a little more closely, as it unfolds before our eyes in five sections.

Ad I.

Here, the speaker begins by saying that Christianity, in its "historical and social appearance" in the world, presents itself "as something infinitely moving and diverse"; but while one wants to leave life a right to diversity, "the core of Christianity," that is, the fundamental, can only be "something that remains the same," that is, immobile. The question as to this "core" is then answered p. 302 is answered thus: "It can now be said right here, and must be counted on by all who have any Christian knowledge, that Christianity rests as a contemporary phenomenon, as on its right foundation, on the facts of the revelation of salvation, on the realities, whether they be historical processes, or whether they be truths given in the form of doctrine, which form the essence, the whole peculiar character of Christianity, and the condition of its existence in general and of its effect of salvation." Here we have only to mention that it is impossible to see why the speaker does not first cite Christ Himself as the essential, real foundation, and then why he says that Christianity rests "on the facts of the revelation of salvation" and not rather simply on the revealed truths of salvation, whether they be given by historical events, by models, or by speech from God. According to the speaker's definition, one would also have to reckon the creation of the world to the "core" of Christianity, for that is also a "fact" of the revelation of divine goodness and love, and indeed such a thing as speaks continually to every man, but where do Christians become through it? But let us hold fast what the speaker wishes to say, namely, that the whole treasure of truth revealed in Scripture is the foundation of Christianity hereafter.

Ad II.

In this section, the speaker shows how this question has been answered in different ways by the various Protestant churches during the last three centuries, and he castigates all those who have divided the teachings of the divine word into fundamental and non-fundamental. Yes, he asserts, by a quotation from Martensen, that the older dogmatists were guilty of a misrepresentation in making this distinction, with Nitzsch: "It is all fundamental what the church teaches." And with Stahl: "For the Church every article of faith is a fundamental article." What moves him to this attack on our old dogmatists? In part, that he seems to be under the delusion that our ancients, by using the word "non-fundamental doctrines," meant to say that these doctrines could not be clearly proved from God's Word, that they were therefore doubtful, uncertain, and therefore of equal importance.

but that was not even remotely their opinion, as will be shown at the end of this essay.

On the other hand, Dr. Mann is under the false impression that he thinks that because the foundation of Christianity, according to his view of life, is nothing other than the entire store of truth in Scripture, it follows that every single revealed truth, as belonging to this foundation, is also a fundamental article in the dogmatic sense, and now takes offense at the fact that our ancients do not count every doctrine as a foundation. But it is evident that among the multitude of revealed divine truths there are many doctrines out of which faith does not have its direct origin, and which are not in themselves organically connected with the doctrinal edifice which serves as a foundation for the Christian's life of faith. Now with quite the same right with which Dr. Mann distinguishes here between doctrine and life in Christianity, and places the latter as the fundamental, although he certainly does not want to deny that the essence of Christianity also includes the Christian life, and thus, with this distinction, only wants to have given each its right position; with the same right, another could distinguish further with respect to the fundamental in the life of Christianity, whereby he would then have to designate the *fides, qua creditur, as the fundamental,* as from which the further Christian godly way of life results; with the same right, finally, a third person may also make further distinctions with respect to Christian doctrine, and thereby indicate what is fundamental, less fundamental, and not fundamental at all; as our old dogmatists do, who are such good teachers precisely because they keep to the saying: *qui bene distinguit, bene docet*.

And who can deny that there is a great difference among the doctrines of the divine word, that some are of such a kind that he who denies them, or even does not know them, cannot be a Christian at all, others again of such a kind that they are ever recognized by the fewest Christians, e. g. the doctrine of Sunday, of the Antichrist. With the little word "non-fundamental" our ancients do not at all say that it is indifferent whether a man accepts these *doctrines* or not; they rather designate them as *objects* of faith, which must be accepted with the same earnestness as the fundamental doctrines; only this they mean to say, that they are not organically connected with the *doctrinal* foundation (*corpus doctrinae*), that they are therefore not articles of faith in the proper sense of the word. Just as a house has not only organically connected parts, but also such objects as are not organically connected with them, as the inner domestic furnishings, e. g. tables, bed, and chair, etc., and even if someone were to steal them, the house itself would not yet be damaged on that account, nor would its solidity be shaken.

By what right, then, do they accuse our old dogmatists of being...

were guilty of a "misrepresentation"? With what right does the speaker say, p. 305: "Whoever says that fundamental articles are only those that are indispensable for the salvation of the soul of the individual and that must be known and believed without fail, is well to see. First, then, these fundamental articles would have to be satisfactorily determined and limited. Then one would like to derive from them consequences for the possibility of ecclesiastical union, which would soon bring the inner error to light"? What should be dangerous in this? Where is the "inner error" to be found? Paul himself distinguishes in 1 Cor. 3, 11. ff. between the doctrine of Christ, which is the foundation, and the doctrines which are added to this foundation as gold, silver and precious stones. Hebr. 6, 1. 2.

Accordingly, the whole Lutheran Church has always made a strict distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines revealed in God's Word.

We cannot, moreover, leave unrebuked the following proposition, which, though introduced only in passing, says: "The most precise exposition of the Christian system of doctrine, if it be built upon the elementary truths of Christianity, without deviation from pure doctrine, can be nothing else than the baptismal formula, or the apostolic creed, presented in their natural development." p. 306. For he shows the speaker's idea that the whole doctrine of salvation can be constructed in detail from a few elementary truths, such as are contained in the baptismal formula or the apostolic symbol, as, for instance, a philosophical system can be blown out, like a soap bubble driven by the breeze of the human spirit, starting from a supreme principle. This is, of course, the assumption of many a newer theologian, e. g. Hoffmann, to whom Dr. Mann unfortunately ascribes the predicate of "an efficient newer theologian" instead of warning against his very dangerous efficiency as a pantheist; but how wrong this way of dogmatizing and systematizing is, is evident partly from the fact that in this case the enlightened mind of man is actually made the source of knowledge, which Dr. Mann does not want to accept in the following either. Mann does not want to accept in the following, because human understanding, no matter how excellent it is, can only be the vessel, the cup, that draws from the source. On the other hand, since God has not revealed his counsel in the heart of man, but in his words, it is clear that it cannot be known *a priori,* but only *a posteriori;* We must therefore seek the individual divine truths in the word of God, and may then arrange them one against the other or among themselves, but we must not presumptuously, beginning with a supreme principle, with one or a few doctrines, wish to construct them out of our own head and heart, or we shall unawares raise ourselves from pupils to teachers, and no longer believe in order to know, but require to know in order to believe.

can. But why does one tread such paths? Because with such "wise words" or systems they want to make the "foolish preaching" of Christ plausible to the Greeks, or even more often to show their own high spirit, they do not consider that it has pleased God "by foolish preaching to make blessed those who believe in it," 1 Cor. 1:17, that he pushes the wisdom of this world with diligence before the head; they do not consider that they thereby make the cross of Christ null and void.

But how impossible it is to let the whole sum of Christian truths of salvation develop logically from one fundamental truth, is shown, as by the above-mentioned single source and nature of these truths, so also by experience, for all those who have attempted it have suffered shipwreck, and after they had made nought of the cross of Christ, fashioned the divine foolishness conformable to the wisdom of the world, and chiseled a wise sermon out of the foolish preaching of Christ, Christ in the meantime slipped away from them with his salvation, and they have kept their empty system.

How could, for example, Dr. Mann, from the Apostles' Creed, not to say from the baptismal formula, even if he unfolded it in such a "natural" way, explain the important doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, of baptism, of the Holy Spirit, and of the Holy Spirit? Scripture, of baptism, of the Holy Communion. If he cannot do this, how may he then say: "The most precise presentation of the Christian doctrinal system can be nothing else than the baptismal formula? be nothing else than the baptismal formula or the apostolic creed, presented in its natural development"? Or how can he say of the fundamental truths, p. 318, "They are also, in essence, all contained and given in the Apostles' Creed, brief as it is?" Something quite different from such a speculative method of wanting to let the whole of the divine doctrinal edifice unfold out of a given truth, like the tree out of its kernel, is that experiential way of our ancient theologians, according to which they compiled and arranged the doctrinal material given in the Word of God according to the importance of its contents, and thus set up a system of doctrine, not out of their own heads and speculation, but out of the Word of God, not out of what is to be sought, but out of what is already given. But let us pass over

Ad III.

Under this heading, the speaker, p. 307, gives the "duels" from which the fundamental is to be drawn (why not duels, since there is, after all, only one, and he also allows only this one to be valid?), and shows that this cannot be, first of all, "our own personal knowledge and thinking"; further, that it is also not "the church with what it does and says. But here the church is reproached that there had been a time when she had risen up against her bridegroom.

and devised doctrines according to their own liking. For it says, p. 309: "But in this consciousness of its own, the church no longer asked whether it harmonized in its essence with the intention of the founder. She presumptuously identified herself with Christ and forgot her complete dependence on him. Thus, in a kind of self-devotion, it proceeded to create, teach, and order. One knows what has become of Christianity in this way." Against these terrible accusations of "the church" one must most solemnly protest in the name of the same; for Dr. Mann ought to consider whom he here refers to by the name of "the church," namely, not the adherents of the pabstry, as he may have in mind, but the congregation of the saints, for these are "the church," but they have not performed those abominations, otherwise the church would have ceased to be a pillar of truth and the host of Christ, which listens to his voice; if the church had done this, we should have seen the impossible, that Christendom would have fallen away from Christ, and thus would have ceased to be church and Christianity; But not she, the church, but the Roman Antichrist with his accomplices, has done all these abominations and more, and has thereby testified to herself as the Antichrist; the church, which lay captive under his external rule, has continually protested against it, and has not ceased, as Christ's bride, to honor her bridegroom, to submit to his scepter, and to confess him in doctrine and life. What an undoubtedly unintentional but no less sinful perversion it is, therefore, to ascribe the raging of Antichrist to the destruction of Christ and his fellow-kingdom members to these fellow-kingdom members themselves, who are and are called "the church," and who have just groaned under it, and even suffered death in part because of it! The words, however, imperiously compel us to this view.

But let us follow the speaker further. As the only source of the fundamental he finally names the holy Scriptures with the following words: "Here is the place where the quite unmeasured importance of the holy Scriptures for our question about the fundamental must leap into our eyes. ... There is the primitive duelle, from which we may draw the right and genuine knowledge about the historical foundation of Christianity, about its ground, founder, and foundation."

Here now, where it is evidently a question of further dissection of the foundation of faith, unfortunately the first real ambiguity occurs, inasmuch as soon from the essential foundation, God Himself, p. 310; soon from the tool foundation: "It seems that everything urges us to say that the whole of Holy Scripture has the character of the fundamental", p. 310; soon again from the dogmatic foundation: "Thus we call, in the proper sense, that sum of truths which represent that foundation of faith on which God Himself rests", p. 310. It seems that everything urges us to say that the whole of Holy Scripture has the character of the fundamental," p. 310; soon again of the dogmatic foundation: "Thus, in the proper sense of the word, we call fundamental that sum of truths which constitute the foundation of faith on which the faith is built.

-The reader is given a point of view from which he could judge Dr. Mann's actions and omissions; much dust is stirred up, and under the cover of it Dr. Mann seeks to win the exit; but the dust he has made himself is so thick that it blinds him himself, he does not find the exit, and finally entangles himself in contradictions. Here is the proof: After we have been instructed above that the entire treasure of truth of the Holy Scriptures is the fundamental, that "the truth of the Holy Scriptures is the fundamental. After we have been taught above that the whole body of truth in Scripture is fundamental, that "it is erroneous to regard individual articles of the doctrine of salvation as fundamental in Christianity, while others are not," etc., Thes. VII; that "it is likewise erroneous to try to decide the question of the fundamental according to the relative value of an article of doctrine for the personal acquisition of salvation," etc., Thes. VIII; further: "for the church every article of faith is a fundamental article"; further: "It is here (with the holy Scriptures) about the most important thing, about the whole foundation of all Christianity and of all that we have in it, do in it, hope from it, about nothing but fundamental truths"; - after we have been supposed to accept all this at face value, this point of view is now gradually changed, and all at once it is quite naively admitted that the holy Scriptures do, however, make a distinction "between the two, between the two, and between the two. After we were to take all this at face value, this point of view is now gradually changed and it is suddenly admitted quite naively that Holy Scripture does make a distinction "between that which - admittedly not by chance and without purpose - is laid on the foundations next door (?), and between that on which the faith and the life of the Christian are built as the supporting foundation". Further, "No one claims that all she says is fundamental." P. 311. Sí, how does this go? Above we are told that all that the Scriptures say is fundamental. Here we are assured with equal calm confidence: No one has claimed that everything it says is fundamental. Above, the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental in regard to doctrine is rejected as erroneous without any reason, and here it is tacitly made again without justification. But a distinction which is made without distinction simply becomes a contradiction.

When now the author says in the following: "And now let us ask about the material of that which we call the really fundamental in Scripture," i. e. what are the fundamental articles of faith which are presented to us in Scripture as the first doctrinal ground? The answer to this question again betrays a confusion, when he adds the following to it: "It is Christ and his salvation; it is the totality of all the fundamental concepts for Christian faith and life that are organically connected with him and his salvation; it is salvation in Christ, with all that stands in direct organic connection with it, representing it on the side of its eternal ground, or its temporal, historical accomplishment as deed and work,

The first thing I want to say is that I do not want to be a part of the world, but I want to be a part of the world. Through all this runs the fundamental idea of redemption." For who can now discern and know what all Dr. Mann reckons among the fundamental articles of faith? Where is there here a certain measure by which to measure? But if the measure is an indefinite one, who can rely on what is measured by it? Who then can say what he has or has not?

Why does Dr. Mann not rather stick to the certain standard of our ancients, namely, that these are those doctrines without the knowledge of which a man cannot come to faith and thus cannot attain blessedness? Quenstedt gives a brief summary of this in the following: "The following is the dogma of faith necessary for all men to believe: God, one in essence, triune in persons, out of immeasurable love toward the fallen human race, forgives the sins of every sinful man who recognizes his sins, through and for the sake of Christ, the Mediator, and his merit, which is proclaimed in the Word and apprehended in faith, imputes the righteousness of Christ, and bestows eternal life." (Theol. did.-pol. P. I. c. 5. k. 355.)

Ad IV.

In this section, the speaker again digresses from his task *in* another direction, although at first it seems as if he were just now going into *mediam rem*. He says right at the beginning, p. 312: "We distinguish in it (Scripture) the actually fundamental truths and all the other material in which the same are, as it were, sunk. It is precisely in this nature of the Holy Scriptures that the need for them lay. It was precisely in this nature of Holy Scripture that the need arose to separate out what was actually fundamental and to fix and formulate it in a clear presentation. . . All this had to produce the result that the fundamentals of Christianity were more sharply recognized, defined, and compiled." Here, then, we are speaking of the fact that necessity demanded that the actual fundamental truths be distinguished from the less or not at all fundamental truths or doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, and that in the ecclesiastical context they should be more clearly discerned and defined. Scripture and to establish them in the ecclesiastical confession. So we may well hope that this distinction will one day be taken seriously and carried out, for it stands, as it were, as a superscription over this whole section?

Want to see! On the very next page (p. 313) it says: "The inner value of the struggle, through which (by the adoption of the symbols) the foundation of faith was more and more uncovered and established, must, however, be recognized by the fact that it was a matter of fundamentals." What is meant by "fundamental" here? Are those doctrines

Is it meant to mean the whole body of doctrine, as we should expect from the foregoing distinction? Or is it called the whole treasure of truth of sacred Scripture, as one might suppose from the first part? No, neither of the two; this latter concept has long since been lost over the many unnecessary excursions. No, here it means only that which has good reason, that which is fixed, that which is true, as opposed to that which is uncertain and fluctuating; this is shown to us by the following, where it immediately bites: "So here is no field for arbitrariness; rather, it is simply a matter of that which is Christianly true, that which is thus fixed, and that in such a way that every individual can rely on it for his salvation and blessing." Again, then, a disappointment, a pit for him who entrusted himself to Dr. Mann's guidance and hoped to find his "Fundamentals in Christianity" on the next path; for who did not expect here a dissection and perhaps still its justification, instead of the assurance that all symbolic doctrines, and after them the holy Scriptures, are unshakable, i. e., unchangeable. Scripture were unshakable, i.e. fundamental? Who would have suspected such a new deceit? For in this sense of fixed and unfixed, of unshakable and fluctuating, no dogmatist needs the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental. This is evident from the fact that even non-fundamental doctrines are nevertheless definite, certain, true doctrines of the divine word; for what cannot be ascertained with certainty from God's word is not a doctrine of the divine word at all, otherwise the predicate of distinctness would not belong to it.

What now follows is a characterization and comparison of the Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed churches, which does not belong here, as so many things do, but which can be accepted in view of the fact that it is very accurate and correct almost throughout. In general, Dr. Mann's strength seems to lie more in the presentation of historical moments than in the development of a doctrinal concept.

Ad V.

How little the speaker has yet solved his task he seems to feel himself, when he thus introduces the fifth section, the end of his work: "Perhaps it will be demanded that we should now define the concept of the fundamental at all more closely, that we should indicate the characteristics of it and delimit its scope." S. 316.

Yes, yes, the "nearer" determination, the "characteristics," the "extent" of the fundamental, all this is loudly and tumultuously demanded. How long do you detain our souls? It is to despair to have worked through so far and not yet know the main thing. O grant, grant us the fundamental! so it cries from the deepest breast of every hitherto tormented reader. Calmly, dear reader! do not hope, wish, ask too much, keep your soul in patience, be prepared for a new deception; you cannot learn, as I told you in the beginning, what the

Author sets up or overturns as fundamental, you probably hear a lot of things called foundation, fundamental, but you can't know what to hold on to in order to get behind the thing. Dr. Mann is a man's man.

Judgment itself. In order to satisfy the above-mentioned, certainly reasonable, demand of the reader to hear a final answer to the question of the fundamental in Christianity, Dr. Mann answers, p. 316: "We would like to say that it (the concept of the fundamental) essentially follows from what has gone before. (Is pure irony; for if such things follow from it for the speaker himself, as the following, what should not all follow from it for the reader, if he is left to himself!) "For it follows that it is that which is continually laid down in souls in the ecclesiastical doctrinal preaching as the ground of faith for blessedness." (Now by this ground of faith may be understood either abstractly the knowledge of the truths of salvation wrought in a man by preaching, or concretely that sum of truths of salvation from which faith chiefly has its origin; in any case, the whole treasure of truth is not meant, which in the first section was called the fundamental, for what soul can fully raise it from the Bible, or, if it be preached to him in its entirety, fully receive it into himself?) But it is a greater sum of truths than what is now called the fundamental, when it is further said, "They are the elements of which this ground of faith consists at all." (In other words, they are the principal or fundamental truths, on which the other truths, which serve as the ground of faith, are built). Further: "These are the things which are not merely believed and known and held to be true, but to which the living faith holds fast, on which it stands, which it regards and confesses as organic parts of the whole of doctrine" (i. e., they are not those doctrines which are merely the object of faith in general, but they are, as our dogmatists say, the so-called articles of faith, which are organically connected with one another, as one member of the body is connected with another by one or more joints). Further, it is said, p. 317: "It is the firm, unshakable thing, which in itself does not yield." Further, "What wants to be fundamental in Christianity must be revealed *explicate* or implicite." Further, p. 319: "That there can be nothing truly Christian which is not based on a Christian fundamental truth, is evident from the concept of the fundamental as the fixed foundation of the truth of salvation in Christ and the living participation in the same." Further, p. 320: "But he who answers such a question in a sense that overthrows the fundamental truths of faith, by his answer to that question calls into question the whole of Christianity, because he overthrows the fundamental in it." Here, as the fundamental in Christianity,

not in dogmatics, again called the fundamental truths of the faith, which at first was resolutely denied. Bold sailor imagination, cast a bold anchor here! *Quousque,* etc.

Here you have, dear reader, everything that you can pick up in the fifth section of definitions and assertions as an answer to the burning question: What is the fundamental in Christianity? You are now left with the choice of what you want to regard as fundamental in Christianity. Dr. Mann offers you the following: 1. the knowledge of the main truths of salvation; 2. a larger sum of truths of salvation; 3. a smaller sum, namely, the elements of the truths of salvation; 4. the elements of the truths of salvation. Pieces which living faith regards and confesses as organic parts of the whole of doctrine; 5. that which does not yield, that which is unshakable; 6. that which is revealed, and only that; 7. the fixed ground of truth of salvation in Christ; 8. the fundamental truths of faith. That in the beginning above all this the whole treasure of truth of the holy Scriptures was offered to thee, thou wilt not know. Scripture was offered to thee, thou wilt not have forgotten it. Now choose for thyself. I am at a loss.

It is still strange that the speaker, after he had so much agitated in the second section, as reported, that all revealed doctrines must be called fundamental, and rejected the usual distinction: fundamental and non-fundamental, now again quite harmlessly and leisurely chats in a few sentences about *articulis puris* and *mixtis, primariis* and *secundariis*, fundamental articles and such doctrines that are not these. He must have been leafing through some old dogmatics, foreboding that things might go badly in the end. One already hopes that in the end he will come out of it halfway and finally let himself and the reader rest in the excellent distinction of the ancients. But a shot of shock at the end shall shatter even this anchor of hope and send Dr. Mann and the harmless reader back into the manly chaos. For Dr. Mann has the distinction of the ancients into fundamental and non-fundamental quite secretly described by Martensen in a quotation at the end of his lecture as a dangerous, even as a "misdirection". It says there: "The conception of a definite quantum of propositions as absolutely necessary to blessedness points back to the consideration of *articuli fundamentales, which* were set up by our older dogmatists, who, notwithstanding their correct determination of the *fides salvifica,* nevertheless described *articuli fundamentales* as those articles, the acceptance of which would be necessary to blessedness, and thus made themselves guilty of a misrepresentation," and so on. This is justified in the following by the fact that the spiritual development of men is different, and that therefore one man can recognize a truth without hindrance to his blessedness, while another can be shipwrecked by it.

faith would suffer. My old dogmatists expressly distinguish the fundamental articles again into primary and secondary, and say only of the former that they must be accepted by every man with consciousness, if faith and blessedness are to exist; and as these are only the most necessary articles, and at the same time indispensable, whether a man be on a higher or lower level, they have thereby made themselves guilty of nothing less than a "rebuke," for Paul demands the same when he says Rom. 10:14. "But how should they believe, of whom they have heard nothing?" It is not the mere existence of the foundation, but only the foundation known, grasped, and kept, that makes one blessed.

Summa, the speaker wanted, as it seems, to throw off the passport of those who, under the pretext that this and that is not essential, not fundamental, throw overboard one doctrine after another, and he wants to do this by making every doctrine of the Holy Scriptures a fundamental, an essential one. But because he does not and cannot carry this out, because in this controversy it is not a question of doctrines in relation to life, but of doctrines in relation to and in relation to other doctrines, in which an intelligible distinction of doctrines was the first requirement: so his whole work is actually a miscarriage, he does not hit the rotten spot at all, and makes tricks of the air. For in the main point, where Dr. Mann is right, namely, that the fundamental thing in Christianity in relation to life is the entire store of truth in Scripture, his opponents are not in dispute; they also put up with the right consequences of this, for these change nothing at all in their course, and the many wrong consequences do not affect them, precisely because they are wrong. So it was quite in vain for Dr. Mann to leave the old trail in order to catch this kind of fox. Our ancients knew better than that, too. The simplest method is to prove to such people clearly and plainly from God's Word the doctrine in question which they wish to avoid, and then to say: thus saith the Lord, and he that is of the truth heareth his voice, and abideth in his speech. But if a man rejects a doctrine, whether it be fundamental or non-fundamental, even though he recognizes that it is revealed in God's word, he does not really reject only that doctrine, but the principle of all doctrine, the foundation of all articles of faith, and thus becomes evident as a basically unbelieving, heretical man, whom, according to Tit. 3:10, must be avoided when he has been admonished once and again.

It would therefore have been much better if Dr. Mann had sought to solve his task under the guidance of the old, rather than the newer dogmatists. It would then have read something like this: The foundation of Christianity, as the very word "Christianity" implies, is Christ, the God-man, for no one can lay any other foundation than him, 1 Cor. 3:11. Now, depending on how this foundation is viewed,

It is sometimes called the personal or real foundation, sometimes the dogmatic or doctrinal foundation. Christ is called the dogmatic or doctrinal foundation, when he is considered according to the complex of the doctrine of holy Scripture, in which he, the real foundation, is presented to man to be grasped by faith; thus, with this distinction, not two foundations are set, but one and the same foundation, only taken in a different way of looking at it, for there is only One. It follows, however, that he who denies or loses the true doctrine of Christ loses not only the doctrine, but Christ Himself, for He offers Himself to us in no other way than in the doctrine.

The dogmatic or doctrinal foundation, to describe it more closely, for it coincides with the concept of the fundamental in Christianity, is the complex of those doctrines of sacred Scripture which stand in such intimate connection with one another that none of them can be removed without mutilating the whole; it is the actual *corpus doctrinae*. The individual doctrines of this organic body are called articles of faith, because they are organically connected with one another and with the whole, like members of a body. Other doctrines of sacred Scripture, which are not so organically connected with the *corpore doctrinae,* are not called articles of faith in the proper sense, but are nevertheless the object of faith and may not be denied as divine truths that have likewise been revealed, because the denial of them would consistently, even if only subjectively, shake and overturn the truthfulness of sacred Scripture and thus indirectly that of the whole doctrinal foundation.

The articles of faith can be divided according to the way in which they are recognized:

I. *articulos puros*, i.e., those whose content is known only by divine revelation, e.g., the article of the Trinity, of the Incarnation of the Son of God, etc;

II. *articulos mixtos*, i.e. those whose content is not only evident from divine revelation, but also from the light of natural reason, e.g. the article of the existence of God, his attributes, etc.

Furthermore, the doctrines of faith, because they are not all of equal importance in their content, may be divided according to this quality into:

I. *Articulos fundamentale*s, i.e., those which describe and reveal Christ, the personal or real foundation, in such a way that whoever does not know them does not know and does not know the most essential things about Christ and how to come to him, and therefore cannot have faith in him. Or they are of such a kind that they may not be denied without nullifying Christ. They are therefore again divided into r

1. *Articulos fundamentales primarios*, i.e., those that everyone must know if the saving faith is to grow up in him. To these belong, for example, the article that Christ is God and man, the article of Christ's merit, and the article of sin. An error in this area, when one of these articles is abrogated, is a fundamental error, that is, it destroys the whole foundation.
2. *Articulos fundamentales secundarios*, i.e., those which cannot be known without violating the foundation of faith, but which cannot be denied without destroying the foundation of faith. Here belong, for example, the article of the characteristic qualities of the three divine persons, the article of the personal union and sharing of the two natures in Christ, the article of original sin, and of justification by faith to the exclusion of any work on our part. He who would deny any of these articles, knowing of course the consequences, would cease to be a Christian, that is, to rest on the personal foundation, Christ. That one cannot know them, and yet stand in faith, comes from the fact that the articles of this class are not exactly necessary that the saving faith should be produced, or remain. He, for instance. Whoever, for instance, did not know that original sin existed, but otherwise believed that he was a sinner, and that Christ was his atonement for sin, would not be hindered by this ignorance from beatific faith, because it would not drive him away from Christ; On the other hand, he who would deny this article, and see the consequences, that he thereby taught an innate holiness and the power to fulfill the law, would thereby himself overthrow the foundation of faith in the narrower sense, *articulos primarios,* and thus be caught in a fundamental error.

II. *articulos non fundamentales*, non-fundamental doctrines, i.e. those that do not belong to the organic context of the dogmatic doctrinal foundation because they are not organically connected with the foundation, but which are nevertheless revealed in Holy Scripture and therefore are the object of faith and demand obedience of faith from people. They are, however, revealed in Holy Scripture, are therefore the object of faith, and require obedience of faith on the part of men. Such are, for example, the doctrine of the eternal damnation of the fallen angels, the historical accounts of the Scriptures, inasmuch as they do not concern salvation. These are, for example, the doctrine of the eternal damnation of fallen angels, the historical accounts of Scripture, inasmuch as they do not contain salvation, the doctrine of Christian freedom in customs, of the Antichrist, and so on. These are not articles of faith, and therefore, without prejudice to the foundation of faith and doctrine, they may be unknown as well as denied, for in themselves they do not break down.

The organic complex of the Articles of Faith, nor does it abolish any other fundamental dogma. But this is not to say that the denial of such a doctrine does not otherwise do harm enough; but he who would deny such a doctrine, even if subordinate, although he knows and sees that it is revealed in God's Word, would thereby, as I have said, deny the truth of the divine revelations and thus likewise fall into a fundamental error. The same is true, finally, of theological problems, i.e., questions about which the Scriptures give no answer, and which, therefore, according to the Scriptures, cannot be answered. The same is true of theological problems, i.e., questions about which Scripture gives no answer and which can therefore be debated on both sides, e.g., on what day the angels were created, by what sin they fell, whether the soul enters the body per *traducem* or *creationem.* Whoever makes assertions in this connection that are contrary to the truthfulness of the Bible or to a fundamental article, will finally fall into fundamental errors. Cf. *J. W. Baieri Comp. prologue. C*. I. § 27. or "Lehre und Wehre," VIII. 208. ff. Had Dr. Mann followed such a scheme, how clear would his work have been, how many important things would have been discussed, how clearly would the antitheses have emerged, and how much more useful would the negotiations have been! H. Hanser. *)

(Submitted.) Poem by M. Zohanni Huttenlocher, pastor at Illingen.

The following "poem" is perhaps unknown to many readers of "Lehre und Wehre". And yet it is "most charming and useful for everyone to read". It is, as it stands, copied from Löhe's "Der evangelische Geistliche". Also what Herder says about it in the fourth part of the "Letters Concerning the Study of Theology" shall be reproduced here. It should only be noted that the original: "Geistliche Kurzweil. J. V. A. (Joh. Val. Andreä † 1654) "Mitgetheilt zu Ergetzlichkeit einfältiger Christen. Anno 1619." is printed here unabridged.

Herder writes: "I would have great desire to give you a complete pastoral theology of my own in verse. "In verse? Indeed, and in rhyme to it, which, in spite of its roughness, is quite made for its subject, and I certainly could not make it better. Plus a pastoral theology that could not be more complete, more varied, truer, more instructive. You think I am joking? I'm not joking. And on top of that, it's by one of the most respected, learned, pious, deserving theologians in our church.

*) By the way, in justification of the Pennsylvanian Synod it must be noted that it was generally not at all satisfied with the above paper. Since Dr. Mann nevertheless had it printed (perhaps in order to hear what others had to say about it), and since, as it seems, no one takes the time to criticize it, the sender of this paper wanted to venture the expense of doing so.

In it he has poured out almost all the experiences of his life (and in his offices he could have many of them), the whole treasure of his heart about what is spiritual office, what is suffering and joy, shame and honor of this state. And in a language that I envy him almost in every broken article, in every shortened syllable, in every rhyme and non-rhyme. And with a salt, a truth! where it should be, with a delicacy! where it should be straight out, with a Deutschheit! - In short, my friend, here's the poem. Read it, and if it should be a little boring to you at times, because of its outlandish form, with points of rest, on and on to the end. Where you find confreres in need of pieces from this pastoral theology, in good and bad sense, do not be scanty with it."

When in my younger days I heard the East say of good benefices, How that soups were not more fierce, Than those given to spiritual lords; Who with dirty mouths would gape at many a good hour: Then I thought, if the opportunity comes, I must also in a long dress And see how I get there. That I may sing for long bratwurst. For if I should deal much in rights, I must first fight out my head. If I then should anoint every peasant, I should be tasty *) everywhere. But here no pen will succeed. My matter will go to the pulpit. There I speak, another must be silent; There I pound, another must suffer; There I go before, another after; There I fall asleep,†) another awake.

For all the arts were in me, I had learned the ropes of logic and the thick books of rhetoric. I had learned the spheres of heaven, And the tales of physics, And the ethics of morals, And the tales of Homer - That I could do as if it were only herbage, No builder would have thought me capable of it.

Thereupon I fell into the Compendium, And turned myself about in it three times, Till I was all gone over with art, And the joke hung out of my mouth. And my skirt rushed on as if I were Decanus. What I saw now I could judge, What came to me I could settle; What I gave up, I made perfect. What the eyes saw, the hands did.

No place was yet emptied of me, though I might be worth the best. But I thought not every parish would be long for thee. But he must be deacon, and then soon after he must be pastor, and then it will be on the decanate until you become "my lord prelate. If then they will have thee also for provost, thou shalt not lack the gifts. But God keep me from the Harz forest, The mountains and the gorges cold; For my belly is accustomed to wine, Therefore the Bacchusgäu suits me. There can I still steal my fortune/ In the meantime enrich me with wine: For he that hath little, cannot come from his own place. If I shall lead my cart on, then nothing must lack the - grease.

Nor had I a passport to acknowledge, That I might also grace the pulpit! I sometimes lost my voice before the people, So at times I ran out of words: The best of me sometimes fell out, And most on the chair I fall. Then I had to bring others to me, who handled things better. All those that made such good posts, And otherwise respected their names; They had to be pressed under me, Till I had eaten all of them;
And if the quintessence came into me, Even many an unsearch'd phrase, That I might be for great and small Diced like a miller's stone,

*) Provincialism for? smelling. A. d. E.

†) *dormito.*

And no casus would come to the toilet,
Whom I had not set his theme-

So I had equipped myself, and all that was needed was to know it. Then I went to the praised land, Where wine is like water, grain like sand, And sought me out a fine place, Where I let myself in like a rat. I asked the people where was the farm, Where they had all they wanted: Wine, grain, fruit, wood, and pasture, I could not find all that was good. So the pavement in the village would not let me stay; I did not like the church tower; The clocks were not right there; Soon I did not like the vicarage; It should be different with me. In sum, what I contemplated, That was all reformed of me. I was the man they waited for, What they had saved for so long, To make every louse a stilt, So I went about with foolish things.

In it I travelled through the green grass, Because there was a beautiful meadow valley. There I saw an old person, hair white, of sight already; She went around in the grass with a rake handle, but didn't do much. She might have compared herself to a parson, But I would have thought she had shirked, To toil with rough work, She might have carried a book of art, To read in it how many a man So masterfully spellbound.

Then I had to register the man and lead him to school again. He said, "***Bona this,*** old man, what kind of a gentleman have you got? "My lord, I'll count the weeds, That I shall not lose a grain." I thought, "I'll have you with this man." Then I cleared my throat and began, "I know not if I am wrong, but methinks you are the village pastor." He said, "I was long ago, ere the Lord saw the world. Forty years ago it was done, and I would that a young man were thin among my peasants,

For I lose all my strength and all my juice. The duller the body, the more to be wrought. The less art, the more we do it. The less worthy, the more we stay."

I said, "My dear old lord, you have fattened yourselves very much, and have plenty of old money, so you want to turn back the stalk. That we young men would suffer, who now eat up the chalk, Expecting happiness, in good health, A good turn and a rich wife."

The old gentleman said, "My studios, I am astonished, your art, it is loosed. Logic will stir in you, that you will speak to me so boldly. Do you know what Luther once said in this matter to a wise man? We of old, who with fear and supplication, To the devil in the hg ..... 's greetings From you mercy, little doctor, On soft cushions g'sessen sein.*) Look into it as long as we do, you'll love the jest."†) The felt was very unfamiliar to me, I wish I had spared the man's. Soon I drew another pipe and said, "Sir, let this be stricken. I was never in earnest, I am bound to serve you. Now I'll have a little talk with you. I'll ask something ***illo tempore;*** You can give me good advice,' What kind of people were there in your time, Who studied well in the arts themselves, Who led the youth in praise?"

He said, "I remember the good day. There was little complaint of scholars. If I should name all the brave men, I think I should not know many. They are dead now, and yet they live; yet they live much, and yet they rot.
I thank them for their good teaching, But when I came here, I had to learn a lot of other things, To break the shells and win the seeds with bitter sweat. You shall learn it again within."

I said, "Ye have hearkened to the spiritual and not to the philosophic." "Therefore might it come to pass, that the world would not have you."

*) In our edition without interpunction. Herder: "Grüßen vor euch Gnad-Docterlein Aus weichen Polstern g'sessen sein." We related "sein" to devil. †) Soon cease, pass away.

He laughed and looked at me with a sneer. "What think you then that I have done?" Said he, "What would my brain have done at that time? I was grammar-like and fine, And pocket overflowing in, I talk loud in many a place And make myself mousy all the time, In my head I had many a jam, And other vicious things more. I have lied so thickly that the beams have shaken, and I have bent the crooked things. Do you think in our time they made masters of asses' hides? Or graduated one in that which he never studied? Or have made a hot one that he will keep secret all his life? Or numbered so roughly that two becomes seven?"

The old gentleman hath startled me again, and hath stolen from me my master's cry. Still I defended myself with all my art, That I had not studied in vain, And said: "May I ask one thing? If you have borne the art all, how is it possible that a builder, who deals but with labor, should inform you otherwise?"

He said: "Yes, of course, deposit, **Until the pretty school sack is packed, And never quacks, the hackemack, Until the air building disappears, Until the cardboard mush is digested, Until the brain's steam is consumed, Until the battle of jokes is engaged, And now the practice comes home, Which drives out all theory.**

That's when we find what we've done That we may have need of it."

These things to me were Spanish villages; I never knew the like. "How," said I, "should the clergy of peasants have their wits? Shall not the high school instruct us How to tame the unwise? What was the theologian but a peasant's church feast"?

He said, "I must forgive you for this, because you still run among the free, if you once come into the cart, There'll be other jesters with you. There you'll be village fool, parish fool, and all sooty stove fool.
There you must believe, know, do, suffer, leave, fear and ho'n, What no one may, can, may nor will. And all this in silence. For he that will complain of this, may empty his parish to another."

I asked the old man through God, that he would only explain the things, For I asked not out of rashness, but as a young blood did. If I could have a report of these things, my day I would not forget.

"Gladly, gladly, gladly," said my old hero, "The wisdom now pleases me much better. For you are but from the press, So you are still too much 'zapfreß', ¶) So you must be mixed a little: I hope you shall yet catch it, And by and by the broad ruck Learn in the narrow stand to adorn, †) So hear with diligence what you did not know. And then atone for the parson's lust. Hear first the order's sentence, And eat thereupon the first collaz. ‡) Hear first my village's grievance; If your skin itch, come hither.

I. "I have said, a psarrer believeth. That scarce a man brings to his head. He believeth in a God that no man knoweth; Every man seeketh after his own idols. He believes in a heaven that's vanquished, That every man loves to revel in.
He believes a' hell that no man glimpses; Each one the broad' road sweeps.
He believes a judgment that no man b'enforces; Every man on the revenge borrows.
He believes in a reward that no one wants; Everyone wants the shell and the stuffing. He believes in a divine rule; Everyone thinks happiness is blind. He believes in a death that separates all, And everyone is waiting for a long time.
So he believes what the world denies And their eyes unruly.
And with that he pulls the heavy cart And is taken for a fool.

II. "After this a shepherd of souls knows...
That the world will not willingly receive.

*) Allusions to the seven liberal arts of that time! Grammar (grammatical), Poetics (pocket), Rhetoric (redt thörlich), Music (mausig), Logic (log dick) etc. ¶) Gleichniß, vom jungen Wine taken from. †) nestling. ‡) Collation, guest meal.

He knoweth that great lords' splendours are utterly despised by God. He knoweth that great shepherds' sleep bringeth many a poor sheep to the wolf. He knoweth that great wretches are cursed for their children's children. He knoweth that great rascals' mouths are turned to hell's howlers at last. He knows that great cocks of feathers come together in the pool. He knows that the world's great opulence is a source of shame and sorrow. He knows that every false heart strengthens itself in eternal pain. He knows this, but no one wants to know, and is very often thrown out because of it. With this he pulls the heavy cart And is taken for a fool.

III. "Third, so must a pastor thon, that every man will groan over.
He must tell the truth to everyone; He will be shown the cowards. He must mop up every hour, When evil is done to him. He must go to the pestilence and to the lazaretto, For many a man goes far beyond. He must to the fire, the gallows, and the wheel, without prison, and the whore's bath. He must comfort desperate boys, He must roast the wicked by the law, He must help everyone, beg, advise, warn, scratch and pour. He must tread in all puddles, He must clean and weed out all unpleasantness. This he must do without thanks, Till he grows old, crooked, and sick. And with that he'll pull the heavy cart, And be taken for a fool.

IV. "Fourth, a preacher must suffer, Since otherwise the tower is humble.
He is sorry for the idolatry, superstition, blessings, and sorcery of the people. He is sorry for the sacrament of the Hansa, which dishonours God and his neighbour. He hates the scorn of God's teaching, for which lust is more wrought. He suffers disobedience and mockery, That*) many a priest for ears goes. He hath wrath, and envy, and revenge, and wrath, and strife, and reproach, and impetuosity.
He hath suffered adultery, fornication, and dishonour, So much thought for folly.
He hath a passion for thieves great and small, for finance and all else he hath not. He hates lies and after-talk, practice, lust, and much dup.... †) With these he draws the heavy cart, and is taken for a fool.

V. "Fifth, a priest must leave that which the world loves above all measure. He leaves the court its rich dress, And keeps the camel's skin for it. He leaves the school its great wit, And exercises himself in the heat of love.
He leaves the silverware of the rich, And drinks the books of error. He makes the puffed-up wind and finds himself in Christ's humilityHe makes the lust and lust of the flesh and binds its back at all times.
He letteth his right, his profit, his peace, And is content to be Christ's member.
He leaves his skin, his flesh, his leg, That he may be with Christ. All this he must willingly leave, And yet hate himself. With this he draws the heavy cart And is taken for a fool.

VI. "Sixth, a spiritual man fears what others easily do...
He fears with awe the end of the world, For which many a man counts his chief good. He fears the evil foes of the churches, The violence and wit of many a friend. He fears the dangers of trouble, In which the great multitude practice, He fears the good words of fortune, Lest the soul be afflicted.
He fears the voice of his own knowledge, lest it cry against him.
He dreads the wicked company's semblance, Without which many a man cannot be.
He dreads the brightness of great gifts, Which else blinds the good altogether. This is his care, his fear, his dread, Which the world despises. With this he draws the heavy cart, and is taken for a fool.

VII. "To the seventh a clericus, What no man will but he must take. He takes less than no one believes, for he does well that steals a benefice. He takes the worst of the stewards, The worst of fruit, the worst of men.

*) "That" more often, where "of" is to be understood. Perhaps: that or for the sake of which some Pfaff goes before the teachings (of the judges). †) Richt printed. From Herder the two lines are omitted like others.

He taketh with pains that he hath sore earned; Nor is the benefice taken for a gift. He takes with pain from his peasants, who pay him like Lauren. He takes all that's rotten from a false hand, Who rejoices when he felt death. *) He takes with thanks what goes unwillingly, And asks a thief for his own. He takes what he has never used, For everyone shuns him for it. So he must travel in beggary And leave poor orphans at last. And with this he draws the heavy cart And is taken for a fool.

"How think you now, my young Hach? Are you again so mindful of the parish? Think'st thou again, thou art bound to that estate which many hate? Do you still crave the parson's roast, or will you gladly do without it?"

I said, "O my dearest father, your words enter into my heart. I am slain and stilled, yet thank God for this hour, That through your wise mouth I may learn the right reason. But I pray you teach me further, Where now I shall turn, For once I am bound to God."

He said, "The way is long since found. Ye have chosen the highest estate, Which hath more peril than the sand of the sea, And is ever run at by the world, Therefore ye need God's hand. No estate on earth ever was more worthy Than he who by God is called to proclaim His word and will, And thereby to nurture God's children, - His truth and justice, His truth and mercy, His long-suffering and also great wrath, His wonders and salvation's horn to intercede by the spirit's speech, To the good of the pious, to the world's vengeance, - Since God the tongue and hand of man hath brought, As it were, to his aid, to dispense his spirit and pledge, To usher them into his kingdom. To whom God's dearest good is entrusted, And Jesus Christ's flesh and blood, As also the Spirit's oil of joy, With which many a soul is blessed.

Let no man dislike your station, Before which all other stations bow. If then the estate be so high and worthy, It hath its grievance.
The devil is not so hostile to any thing, as where Christ's pen is well fenced. The world needs no more deceit than that the priest should be justly silent. The flesh of his own will not leave his deceit to deceive a true and pious heart. And so the greatest danger to the church comes from the Baal's band. For no bloodshed has ever harmed the church, like hypocrisy, since they seek themselves, not Christ, and always lack good fruit, since they want more wit and cleverness, than Christ's simplicity is the goal, or else go in great houses, - all run after the leaders. In sum, he that will not watch diligently... The more danger, the less pay. A servant of God shall have no gold.
He that will take his pay here, him the Lord will not know. Here he shall work, he shall keep, he shall watch; There he shall be well rewarded and highly esteemed. Here it shall be laborious and worthless, There it shall be quiet and highly honored. Here it will be poor, bad, and unheard, There it will be warm, right, and learned. No pious man will put money here, as he can make X out of U. Pious money is not augmented here, As to him,‡) who leads the pen. Good money doesn't have to be as wonderful as the one who gets fat in a year. Pious money can't be hurried on foot, Like evil money from the nags on the horses. Good money makes merry as God makes it merry. Evil money doth dust, as much as it doth suck. ‡‡)

"If you want to feed Christ's herd, see that you are called by Christ's order, not ***obliquely*** by evil, woman, money, and other ***things***. God calls right through the upper mouth, He calls also in the heart's reason, And as the pious Luther said, So much also stands by the church. Do not haste too much, God knows you are well, your part shall be well. Let go that which will not stay;

*) As if he felt death. †) Used? ‡) The "then" in the original is probably misprint. ††) Grows. ‡‡) "Deceives".

God findeth his own in quietness. It is the fault of the loose course that many a hireling is tolerated. There's no worm so dangerous to the body that would be in his place. A corpse is scarce chilled when some one will manage his service. O, if pursuit did stir, how many a man would not cry, "Here am I!"

"When ye are come to the church, And have taken the heavy oath; Now prepare yourselves with heart and courage, That ye will take it all for good. Yea, as he hath humbled us, so must ye learn to limp. Woe unto you, if they praise you too much! Bless you, when the world's rage is too great. Woe unto you, if your service be sweet, Woe unto you, if you find much vexation. Woe unto you if the world please you, Woe unto you if it set you a snare. Woe unto you that seek honour, Woe unto you that live in vain. Woe unto you that look upon titles, Woe unto you that trust in few things. Woe unto you, if ye stay here, Woe unto you, if the world pours you out. So may ye be God's stewards, A thorn to the world, A rue and a torment.

"We have yet to dare the house cross, As each marriage is burdened. What each man hath, that may come to us, All daily's fate to hear on earth. If you will but take the shortest road, That you may be blest with God's blessing;
Let not too much be done on earth. Heaven is better for you. Let your people be accustomed to a bad way, For not more is learn'd than a court. Let work do what it will eat, and there is plenty of time for rest. Trust not too well to every mouth. Evil is fresh, good is foul. Consider not lightly the poor, but God's good in't. Know not too much, I charge you, that you are not the village doctor. Believe not all that is taught; untimely zeal some do bear.
I'll tell you this too. Don't depend on man. God be your scopus, that man must help you. Otherwise, where man is to help without God, then it's a matter of running, greasing and helping,

And yet is nothing but words and appearances; He who wins can be over you; So your idol has left you; He who has nothing may puff away. O short time and vile joy, How many a man hast thou shown gold, And set him in the deepest grave.*) He shall believe it that hath tried. I am, to speak with breeding, of the people that are not hanged in the smoke. If they could put me in the furnace, they would not need other sticks. I have kept my people so, and now it is time for me to be sorry.

He would have outraged me with this, perhaps he would have unravelled much. I fell in the mire, and said, "I Thor call you with honour preceptor. My good, pious, wise lord, had I come hither long ago. My ears should be shorter, my trunk purer than a pig's. I have followed the fools' guild, where unreason reigns supreme. I thought every village had a treasure that could not be caught without a rope. Now I'll give myself to you to kill my worm, and take off my ring and my hat†) The skirt and the bouquet well, And poke my nose in the book, That I may seek such new leges. So that when I come among the people I shall not pass as one who is not divorced."

That struck my old lord. He said: "I'd rather do than teach young people, who are still a year old, what they still lack. It may, however, what still sweats, And still well butt ears glistens, Nit allway suffer that we dudes Want to frighten him their great art, Which is seen in the great book, Therefore many an old man ducks and thinks: Let the clever noses run up, That the red noses give him lessons, as in the world, It many a naughty have lacked. But alas, I must also confess, And will with my pain within, That not all that is black is spiritual; That not all that is spiritual is pure Christian, That not all that is pure is wholesome, That not all that is wholesome is for the mouth."

*) Koth? †) The academic Magisterzierde.

Then the honest man asked me, 3I would go home with him, There help eat a little soup: The smacking will not forget itself. He must carry home by the rod The pretty bird he caught, And bring it to his old mother, She knows of these things too, That's why she knows To pluck out the young drops The gossamer feathers - And tell him in vain her t'ink. The house, that is very near, where he often splits many a thick block with his wooden stick, willingly "lays" love and sorrow, heals many a deep house wound, ducks in many a stormy wind, adorns himself in many a weather, rejoices in many a misfortune, peers through many a little hole.

So I went with shame and joy, My heart was narrow and wide. My art was small, yet I heard much. My regrets were great, yet I hasted to my goal. I would not that I had seen all the foreign lands. For a German heart, if it be found, is better than many a foreign tongue. He says what is lacking and advises it. And with this one comes to his rest with God. But that which only chattereth mum, mum, mum, And tosseth the porridge about in the mouth, That needs much time. Money, toil, and trouble, That one in vain may gain. Now I wish that all my friends would cut off their skins and join Christ's order, which has never been sweet to a pious man. Hereby I follow my old man, Who knows better, who knows better.

Misellen.

Usury and the Iowa Synod. In the last issue of this journal we expressed the faint hope that the gentlemen of Iowa might after all "**agree in** the doctrine of usury with the two greatest theologians of our **Church, with the two Martinuffs." - "Alone, how can a** man deceive himself?" In the March issue of Brobst's Monthly, the continuation of Iowa's paper "on the lending of money on interests" has appeared; but if in the February issue it had seemed as if the gentlemen of Iowa were making a show of putting in their lances against the two Martinuses, the March issue presents the terrible spectacle of how those belligerent heroes are now trying to run their lances through the bodies of the two Martinuffen without pity. Admittedly, every reader, when he watches the gruesome fight, at first the hair stands on end, since it looks no different as if the two mentioned dead lions were carried around in triumph impaled by their enraged enemies and shown as monsters manly, which up to now terrified the country, but now made harmless. But if one looks at the thing a little more closely, especially if one looks at the long spear used more closely, then, thank God, the fright soon subsides. The long spear is not the word of God, which is certainly sharper than a two-edged sword, but nothing but a funny dream about it. Of course, the Iowans seek above all the main passage of the Holy Scriptures, which condemns usury. Of course, the Iowans seek first of all to eliminate the main passage of Scripture that condemns usury, namely, the word of the Lord: "Lend, that ye hope nothing for it" (Luk 6:35). But how do they now begin to prove that, though, according to Christ's judgment, nothing is to be hoped for in return for lending, yet "interests" are to be hoped for? - They say that in the Sermon on the Mount it is not a question of the outward work, but of the attitude! Yes, they say with Tholuck: "Christ's mode of expression is that of the popular orator, and not that of the school... hence no right to call it a "school of thought.

to take the letter so exactly and to press it. The popular speaker puts down his word briefly and grainy, and counts on the *sensus communis*" (the Americans say "*common sense*") "of his hearers as interpres (!), which, according to the intention of the speaker and the context of the speech, will add here, subtract there." Who must not turn away from such hermeneutics with disgust and abhorrence! According to Christ's saying, one should have the attitude that one hopes for nothing in return for the loan; but to demand something in return according to outward works, that is right, because that is what the "*common sense*" teaches, which is the "*interpres*" (interpreter) of the words of Christ, as a popular speaker! The lecture also calls attention to the fact that lending on interests is not always a work of mercy, but often a "*contractus civilis*" (civil contract), "a trade" or something similar, such as renting a house, so that in this case one can just as well take interests for lending money, "as he who rents a house, etc., may confidently demand a house rent from him who has taken the house on loan (!)". Truly, a delicious theology and philosophy! As soon as a Christian does something condemned by Christ, he may, according to Iowa theology, only say: I do not want to do this as a Christian, it should only be a civil contract! and immediately it is permitted to him. The gentlemen of Iowa have evidently heard of the difference between the Christian as a Christian and as a citizen, and have not understood the matter; they have heard, as one is wont to say, ringing, but not beating together. It will therefore be necessary that this point, too, should be discussed exactly according to God's Word. What philosophy, furthermore, is this; that civil lending is a trade? If it were really so, who would not like to be a purchaser, and to bargain for a hundred thalers with ten per cent? Unfortunately, however, everywhere, with the exception of Jowa's Utopia, the fatal distinction is made between borrowing and buying, that one must return what has been borrowed undiminished and can only keep what has been bought. A similar philosophy is the comparison of lending with deck Vermiethen; for, as is well known, there is the small difference between the two, that in the case of lending the borrower bears the risk of loss for what is borrowed, but in the case of renting the lessor bears the risk of loss for what is rented. When it is said further on in the speech: "Natural equity speaks against the one part, the borrower, alone receiving the benefit of the money lent," it is indeed hardly explicable why the speaker stops here and does not conclude further: Thus, of course, natural equity, indeed quite common justice, also speaks against the one party, the borrower, bearing the risk of loss alone, and the other party, the lender, being sure and certain of his capital alone, as well as of the possible benefit from the use of it on the part of the borrower. If, furthermore, the treatise points out that Scripture, where it speaks of usury, "usually" or "as a rule" has in view such lending, "which is a work of mercy," hence the treatise emphasizes the words which in some passages speak especially of the poor, it is evidently a conclusion "*a particulari ad universale,*" when the treatise concludes from this that therefore in all passages of Scripture there is only talk of such lending. But this is a conclusion of which a little student has to be ashamed, much less a professor. Finally, here, where of course we cannot think of it, we have to deal with the whole jumble of Scriptural distortions occurring in the lecture.

I would like to share the following with you. In order to victoriously strike down Luther's doctrine of usury with his own doctrine, the paper says: "Indeed, it is downright inexplicable how the same persons" (of course we and our teacher Luther are meant) "who so zealously argue for the non-sinfulness of the institute of slavery (per se)*) burden and confuse the consciences of Christians with their usury law. A more glaring contrast, a cutting contradiction, can hardly exist. It is neither against the natural law nor against the law of love that one man buys and sells another like a chattel or like a piece of cattle, that a slaveholder breeds slaves (!!!) and keeps slaves, and that the slave must serve the slave-owner with all his time and strength, without receiving wages for it; but, on the other hand, it is said to be against the law of love and against the natural law, if a poor man takes interest from a rich man for borrowed capital, with which the rich man increases his fortune." etc. In this tirade, too, there is first of all a logic, such as the following: "It is asserted to be compatible with Christianity that an emperor may cut off the head of a criminal, and yet it is supposed to be contrary to Christianity if I only give a slap to a bad fellow! Can there be a more glaring contrast, a more cutting contradiction?" This is a logic that Mr. Iowans probably learned as devout listeners to an abolitionist stump speaker. Incidentally, it can hardly be excused by a lack of the ability to think correctly when the speaker first correctly states Luther's and our doctrine of slavery by means of the little words "in itself" which he places in parenthesis, but then adds accidental circumstances which make slavery sinful,' and then shamelessly argues from his fiction to our self-contradiction. But it is beyond all infamy when here the speaker even imputes to us that we have zealously argued, or are still arguing, for the breeding of slaves as something in itself non-sinful. One can see from this that Mr. Iowans regard Brobst's Monatshefte as a stump from which one can harangue the surrounding rabble with equally mendacious slander against the common enemy, as well as tickle the ears of the same with impolite, chaste and disgusting speeches. The end justifies the means!

W.

There is an interesting article **on commercial speculation in** this year's second quarterly issue of the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review.* Perhaps some readers think that thoughts on commercial speculation belong in a mercantile, not a theological, journal. But one is mistaken. Where sin begins, the theological field begins, and only where it ceases to be a question of what is sin and what is not sin does theology find its limit. The Holy Spirit is to punish the world for the sake of sin. The Holy Spirit is to punish the world for sin and for righteousness and for judgment; but he wants to do it through the word, thus also through the theologian, who has the office of the same. What value has theology if it does not shine as a light into the darkness of a world alienated from God, and if it does not by its light punish and judge all that is against God? A theology that sets itself no other goal than to bring men to the point where they engage in godly practices, but does not inquire whether in their bourgeois mandel they are living according to the principles of God.

*) This parenthesis is added by the speaker himself as a precaution. W.

Theology, which acts in the name of the kingdom of God, has nothing but the name and does not deserve it. Only too much have theologians hitherto omitted what they ought to have done in order to convince men that not going to church, nor experiencing powerful religious stirrings of heart and conscience, is Christianity, if going to church and the experienced awakening do not at the same time have the consequence that one also becomes strictly conscientious in his civil profession, that is, now asks in everything whether it is also right according to God's word, may the whole world unhesitatingly allow it? There are only too many, especially here in America, who are regarded as extremely religious, as strict "church people," as mighty worshippers, and who really seem to be living saints on Sundays, but who in their business dealings act just like the unconverted children of this world. It is certainly most gratifying, therefore, that in the aforementioned theological journal, in the midst of the center of the American business world, a subject is discussed which, more than any other, especially here in America, needs the weight of the divine word. From the article we communicate only the following: "By speculation in commerce, as distinguished from regular, orderly trade, is meant the purchase of goods, lands, merchandise, or other property, "m to make a profit by the anticipated rise of the same in price, or the sale of the same with the condition of delivering them later at a certain price, in the hope that the goods thus sold and to be delivered will so fall in price before the time of delivery that they can then be put up for sale at the fixed price with a profit. This latter kind of speculation is usually confined to public value-papers, and differs little from an unbridled game of chance. It has no connection with legitimate trade, and is a mere throwing of dice to test one's luck as to whether one will win or lose. With respect to the moral principles which decide this subject, note: l. that speculative buying is in itself one of the morally indifferent things. It is not in itself morally evil; that is, the mere investment of money in property, which is expected to rise in price, is not a moral offence. 2. That the moral character of speculation depends on its manner, its end, and its effects. If these are bad, the speculation which comprehends them in itself is also bad, and in many degrees criminal and detestable. If it bears the character of gambling, it also bears the moral censure of gambling. Accordingly, the making of contracts and purchases, and gambling, where, according to the known laws of nature and providence, the outcome cannot reasonably be foreseen even with probability, is reprehensible. It is a pure game of chance. Every speculation that involves the use of artifices and machinations to raise prices above their normal level and real value is harmful and immoral, and this, of course, in the degree to which the artifices used are bad and reprehensible, and the objects thus distributed belong to the necessary needs of life or of the state. Is it not a crying injustice to use artifices to extort unreasonable prices from the people for their food and clothing, merely that the speculator may enrich himself? When we consider the great number of people who find it difficult to feed, clothe, and shelter themselves, is it not a terrible cruelty to think of enriching oneself in such a way that these people are in

hunger and nakedness? Think that this is done by spreading false rumors of the coming scarcity, or by buying up or helping to buy out the stock, so that the market may be controlled; is this not a great evil and doing no good, and is it not in every respect a despicable and unjustifiable procedure? Even in regard to objects that do not belong to the necessities of life, it is a manifest injustice to exalt them above their proper value. It leads to the elimination of all proper standards, to uncertainty and fluctuation in business, to the encouragement of speculation and gambling, instead of regulated trade and flourishing industry. What else could be the consequence of driving up the prices of flour, butter, and cotton by double, and those of securities by twelve times, the real and ordinary market price, as is done by speculators? *) If, therefore, one buys an article on speculation, on which many speculate, in order to drive up its price unlawfully, this means actually, though perhaps unconsciously, assisting in the realization of such a price increase. And if this is detrimental to the great public interests, or to the people in general, it seems to us the duty of all to refrain from any such encouragement. Thus, when men, in the hope that gold will rise, buy it up and keep it out of the market, in order to promote the rise, and so make a profit, they contribute in this way to the rise, and to all the evils which spring from it to the people and the State. Without doubt, the fraudulent rise of gold has been promoted many times in this way. We honor the patriotic and good capitalists who, for this reason, have conscientiously refrained from all participation in gold speculation. The same principles apply to the ordinary articles of commerce, as: Groceries, Clothes, Foodstuffs, Groceries, Government Supplies in War, etc. No one is justified who enriches himself by shortening the government and increasing the sufferings of the poor. All speculation, however, distinguished from actual commerce and dealing in gold and other articles which the state or the people have absolute need of, leads to that disastrous end, and should be carefully avoided by all good men."

*Judge Davenport, of the Connecticut court of former days, was noted for his Puritan severity, which often seemed angular, harsh, and repulsive. At a time of bad harvest and great scarcity he had rich treasons of corn, and his barns were full. He sold his abundance to the poor at the usual price, beating the famine prices of the markets, and lent or gave to those who could not pay. But if any wealthy person wanted grain from him at that price, he firmly refused, saying: 'You are in a position to buy at the market price; the poor cannot; I, as a steward of God, keep my store for them.' There was more worth, manliness, nobility, philanthropy, let alone godliness, under his rough, almost prickly exterior, than in a legion of the fine, trim, polite gentlemen of our day, who have no compunction to eat the houses of widows and the bread of orphans by dishonest manipulations and speculative tricks, though, like their ancient models, they may offer up long prayers.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Even the Reformed are now beginning to demand **personal registration for communion.** The "Reformiüe Kirchenztg." of April 15 reports from a preachers' meeting held last year: "Unrestricted admission was called a decided abuse, and at least timely personal registration was demanded. . . If one does not always talk to everyone, one must still be able to do so with everyone. At the Lord's Supper the sad state of the church becomes quite apparent; for personal acquaintance, which is necessary, is lacking, and it can be promoted by registration." Incidentally, Calvin wrote to the people of Mömpelgard in 1543: "That those who wish to partake of the Lord's Supper should present themselves to the preacher for an examination displeases me so little that I rather think we should be asked to do so of our own free will. For this would be the best nerve of godly and holy discipline in the church. . . The lawful use of it is, first, that it be, as it were, a private catechesis for the confidential instruction of the ignorant; second, that the institution be used to remind and punish those who fall short of their duty; and finally, that it serve to raise and strengthen troubled consciences." (***Epp. et consil. ed. Beza. Lausannae***, 1576p. 99.) W.

A curious find. In the course of tunneling and other excavations, many discoveries have been made in Cincinnati, Ohio, and elsewhere, which indicate that the continent of America was inhabited many years ago by a people who had attained a certain degree of civilization. A curious discovery, recently made in the course of excavations in Cincinnati, furnishes a new proof of this. In digging a tunnel, the workmen discovered that at a depth of about 15 feet they had come upon what is called an Indian Mound. The mound, which turned out to be a grave, contained the bony remains of a man of unusual size. While digging through the earth, a German found a small silver coin the size of a quarter of a dollar. According to the report of a knowledgeable eyewitness, the coin is one of the oldest ever found. It contains a small ring on the upper rim and will undoubtedly have served as jewellery. One side shows a vase of flowers and Hebrew writing around the edge, of which the word "Jerusalem" has been deciphered. The other side shows a laurel branch and around the same also Hebrew writings. How did this come from the far Orient into the primeval forests of America, where it lay buried perhaps several thousand years beside its owner? Is the assumption, advocated by many, that the ancient, long-lost people who inhabited this continent were the lost Israelites of the empire of the ten tribes, correct? (Christian Ambassador.)

Southern General Synod. In the ***Lutheran and Visitor of*** March 25, we read "If circumstances should require us (in the South) to become one with one body or another (in the North), the majority of the ministry and almost the whole laity would return to the old General Synod. " W.

II. Abroad.

Hesse. 57 metropolitans (superintendents) and pastors of the Lower Hessian Church have addressed a petition to His Majesty the King, in which they ask for the restoration of the Consistory in Casse! because through the unification of the Reformed Consistory in Casscl, the Lutheran Consistory in Marburg, and the Uniate Consistory in Hauau into a single Uniate Consistory in Marburg, the legal status of the Lower Hessian Church has been deeply shaken and its independence called into question. (Stader Sonntagsbl.)

Münkel against Luther. In an article in the "Neues Zeitblatt" with the headline: "Does the Reformed Lord's Supper Give the Body and Blood of Christ?" Dr. Münkel writes: "Luther had the worst idea of Zwingli and his comrades. Several of Zwingli's remarks had made him so suspicious that he believed he saw the spectre of a barbarous unbelief and paganism behind them. And so it may have come about that he considered their church system only a sham and a deceptive show, to which he attributed no power or divine gift. Subsequent times have judged differently. We can no longer uphold Luther's judgment." - Which "subsequent time" has judged differently? And where is the judgment of this court published? In No. 51 of the "Neues Zeitblatt," for instance?

Spain. The Ayuntament of Madrid has promised to give the Protestant Committee 17,000 feet of land on which to build a church, a presbytery, and two schools, on condition that the building proceed immediately. The building site is next to the Guayamedezna, where Protestants used to be burned. In many places in Europe money is being collected by Protestant committees for the support of the Protestants in Spain, and it is to be hoped that many a congregation will be collected. However, it soon becomes apparent that this is no longer an age like that of the Reformation. The people in general have neither a desire nor a sense for Christianity, but are predominantly enlightened unbelievers who prefer political freedom and progress without religion. Thus it is very significant that the first religious book that appeared in Spain after the Revolution was "Renan's Life of Jesus." (Evangelist.)

The fight of the faithful direction in the "Confessional Churches" of Germany and also in the united church against the unbelieving direction (Protestant Unificationists) is becoming more and more prominent, says the "Messenger of Peace". District Synods, Provincial Synods, Superintendents, Consistorial Councils, etc., are raising their voices earnestly and urgently against the unbelieving direction. - It is certainly laudable that the Uniate Church of Prussia at least raises its voice against Christ-deniers such as Harme, Schiffmann and comrades, and it is also understandable that a Uniate newspaper in our country rejoices in this, but should not the Uniate side also acknowledge for once what injustice the Uniate Church Regiment of Prussia continues to commit against resolute Lutherans within the Uniate Church? - Is the unbelief of a Schiffmann, a Hanne, a Lisko, etc. justified in the Union? No! But they are left in their offices. Is the Lutheran confession fundamentally justified in the Union? Yes! Nevertheless, where a Lutheran makes use of the right vested in him, the church government raises not only its voice, but its judicial arm against him. - The dismissals of Lutheran pastors are sufficient proof of this.
(Wisconsin Community Journal.)

In Pomerania the fight against the Protestant Association is lively. The main representatives of it are Professor Hanne in Greifswald (formerly pastor in Hannöverschen) and Archdeacon Schiffmann in Stettin. The zealous and active Pastor Quistorp in Ducherow came out against them with an outspoken declaration. As a result of this, a newspaper feud broke out with Schiffmann, and there was also a personal meeting with Hanne, which is both amusing and saddening at the same time. During a visit to his hometown of Greifswald, Quistorp read in the weekly paper an invitation to a meeting of the Protestant Association, at which Professor Hanne wanted to speak about the meaning, origin and content of the Bible. Since admission was open to everyone, Quistorp decided to see for himself how things went at such a meeting. In front of a mixed audience, which at the same time entertained itself with beer and cigars, Hanne delivered in his speech about the same thing that he had demonstrated in Barmen, that the Bible was a book of human origin, like all other books, and so on. The speech was spiced up with a few digs at Gustav Iahn, the well-known author of the Song of Songs, and the (as yet unrecognized) Quistorp. When the chairman asked if anyone wished to comment on the lecture, Q. asked to speak, and gave a warm and decisive testimony in favor of the Bible of the Old and New Testaments. Hanne sought

in his excited rebuttal to refute the evidence presented and to present the Protestant Association as a legitimate tendency in the Church. A Professor Susemitzl admonished: "Orthodox and Protestants should, instead of fighting each other, rather make common cause against the completely unbelievers. Quistorp replied: "As long as the Protestant Association does not desist from its unbelief, as long as it continues to hold the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, of miracles, and of the Church, as long as it continues to hold the doctrines of the Holy Spirit. As long as it declared the teachings of the Holy Trinity, miracles, and answers to prayer to be "silly stuff," and Jesus to be a "weak-minded man" or a "pious fanatic," there could be no peace between it and the confessors of the Bible faith, but only a fight to the death. When the chairman had threatened in a rather indelicate manner with the use of the right of the house, Q. turned to leave, and not without difficulty and resistance gained the open air through a closely-packed crowd which the interesting debate had drawn from other rooms of the alehouse, "on the one hand full of deep sorrow in his heart over what he was experiencing, on the other hand full of heartfelt joy that the Lord was worthy of him to confess his name and to suffer shame for his name's sake." A few days afterwards Q. offered to engage in a public disputation with Professor Hanne, in order to expound the perversity of the Protestant Union doctrines, but this challenge was summarily rejected. Suppose an unbeliever challenged a believing preacher to a public disputation, and the latter refused, what a clamor would be raised, and how the unbelieving newspapers would toot their horns, as if the cause of Christianity were thereby judged! But if the reverse were to happen, it would be said, "Yes, peasant, that is quite different!" But we want to thank the intrepid Pastor Q. for his frank testimony and remember Matth. 10, 32. (Stader Sonntagsbl.)

Duchy of Saxony-Altenburg. Here, the Lutheran Consistory was abolished on December 17 of last year and, by law of January 4 of this year, became a collegially organized ministerial department for cultural affairs. The Consistory itself, at least officially, was not consulted and heard. Only the internal affairs of the church belong to the competencies of the new authority. Matrimonial matters have been separated.

From Bavaria one writes to the "Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz." The danger that mainly threatens us will not come from the Berlin O.-K.-Rath and his national church dreams, because for the absorptive Union the Bavarian regional church would like to be too large and quite indigestible a morsel! But the unbelief that is also spreading among us in town and country, the unchurchly, even anti-church spirit, about which louder and louder complaints are being heard, especially from the Franconian provinces, should make it possible for the call to unification and to the flag to find an entrance here as well.

Position of the school teachers in Hanover. One writes to the aforementioned church newspaper: According to an appeal decision of the Prussian State Ministry, the DiSciplinar Law of July 21, 1852, must also be applied to the elementary school teachers in Hanover, so that their former position in the former kingdom, where "the sextons, organists and school keepers, rectors and cantors in small towns and villages, as well as in the country" were considered *clerus minor,* according to a Consistorial circular of 8. Dec. 1801, and in this capacity were subject to the diSciplinary regulations governing church servants, can by no means be considered any longer, since since the introduction of the Prussian constitution the teachers have been "administrative officials".

Portugal. In November of last year, a British subject residing in Oporto, named James Cagnells, was sentenced to six years' banishment for having held Protestant worship in his house "contrary to the legally established religion of the country. The good life and the acknowledged charity of the accused were still accepted by the court as mitigating reasons.

(General Ev. Luth. Kirchenztg.)

Spain. In Madrid, on Sunday, Jan. 24, the first public service was held in the Protestant church.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume XV. June 1869. No. 6.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W, W.
(Continued.)

§ 32. d.

A fourth rule is that the preacher should not give the sick person the spiritual nourishment he needs in the form of a sermon, but rather in the form of a conversation; in particular, he should not preach much to the seriously ill, and if they are in great pain, he should only call out to them sayings from the Holy Scriptures with very short applications and with suitable song verses mixed in, pausing from time to time, and he should preface them with short, so-called sighs. In any case, the preacher should not only urgently exhort the patient to prayer, especially in cases of serious illness or when great spiritual distress is connected with the physical illness, but should also recite prayers directed at his condition or, depending on the circumstances, make a fervent intercession for him at his bedside.

Note 1.

Bidembach writes: "One must also consider the great pain of the sick, which does not always allow much talking. Therefore one must let them remain with less speech and answer, so that they are not made unwilling or even too dull. And then it is especially necessary that one take care to be brief. *) For this was the praise of Job's friends, of whom it is written, Job 2:13, They spake not unto him a good while, because they saw that the grief was very great. - It is not necessary to give comfort and other things, nor is it useful to gather together too many *dicta scriptures* (Bible verses) at one time and to coacervire (heap up) them; for otherwise the

*A preacher must not let himself be alienated, and must not in every case regard it as a bad sign, if the spiritual encouragement seems to become too long for the patient very soon. This can easily be the case even with those who otherwise have a great desire for God's Word.

They do not keep the weak, nor do they sustain or refresh themselves with them. Wherefore this is most profitable, that a *dictum scripturae* (among which there may be a choice), three or four, the strongest, and in which there is most adherence, be held forth to the sick, or according to the occasion of the person (if they be simple and not acute) a little explicire or accommodire upon the person; that they may be managed for a time, and so made to imagine it until another time." (*Manual*. p. 648. f.) It is natural that the preacher, if the condition of the sick person permits it, especially in chronic illnesses, should also deliver longer connected addresses to the sick person, read and expound to him larger passages of sacred Scripture (e. g. John 5, 1-16. Isa. 38, 1-22, Job 33, 15-30, Luc. 15, 11-32, whole Psalms, especially the penitential Psalms, the seven letters of the Lord to the churches of Asia Minor, Revelation 2 and 3, etc.), share the content of the last sermon preached in the public church service, or read it aloud, etc. In the case of chronic illnesses, if these permit a longer mental occupation, the preacher must also take care that the patient receives a suitable lecture, for which, in addition to the Bible and catechism, depending on the circumstances, among other things, Luther's folk library, the Concord, etc., are suitable. Luther's Volksbibliothek, the Concordienbuch, Fick's Lutherbuch and Märtyrerbuch, Lassenii Trostreden, H. Müller's Erquickstunden und Liebeskuss, Gotthold's zufällige Andachten, Gotthold's Siech- und Siegesbett, our Lesebuch and the like; also the large and small Ev.Lutheran prayer treasure would be recommended.

Note 2.

In order that a preacher, even if he is called quickly and without encouragement to a sick person, does not lack the necessary material, it is necessary for him to make a collection of inspiring and comforting sayings and hymns for all kinds of soul conditions and to memorize them well and, when he wants to visit a sick person, either repeat them to himself on the way or, before he sets out, quickly run over them. A rich collection of this kind is found in the larger "Ev. Lutheran Prayer Treasury. St. Louis, Mo., by M. C. Barthel, General Agent of the Synod of Missouri," pp. 377-424. A stock of especially stirring or comforting stories may also be well used at times at the bedside of the sick, and render excellent service.

Note 3.

What is given to a sick person according to his particular state of mind, as well as according to the nature of his illness (in great pain, in protracted illness, in hot fevers, in gout, in intestinal congestion and subsequent miserere, in cancer, consumption, dropsy, etc., if the patient has contracted the illness himself,

in painful and dangerous operations, etc.) is to be held out from God's Word, about this the richest and most excellent material is found in "Gottfried Olearius' *Collegium pastorale* oder Anleitung zur geistlichen SeeleN'Cur" (Leipzig 1718. 4.), as well as in "Nic. Haas' der getreue Seelenhirte" (St. Louis, Mo., 1868, bet F. Dette. Price: K3. 25.), finally also in Christoph Tim. Seidel's Pastoraltheologie, edited by F. E. Rambach, pp. 211-229. - Here it should only be noted that the preacher, even if he perceives in the sick person the greatest ignorance and blindness about himself, the grossest self-righteousness and impenitence, must not despair of the possibility that the sick person can still be helped, or proceed immediately in a scolding and blustering manner. Rather, in order to effect true repentance in the sick person, he must show him in calm earnestness the spirituality of the law, how serious God is about it, and especially hold up to the patient that from the divine law in which he finds a mirror of his very heart and life. By the way, the preacher must not forget that there are many who, even in gross sins, seem to live securely, who, according to their confession, do not want to be sinners, who only continue to sin and speak out so rudely because they are in secret despair and therefore think that they cannot be helped, that they are irredeemably lost. According to Romans 5:20, in spite of the excess of their sins, they are to be shown the full riches of divine grace and mercy in Christ. The same is the case with those who, without anyone knowing it, have some terrible crime (perjury, murder, adultery, incest, and the like) on their conscience, and therefore cannot rest. If the preacher notices in a patient that he remains closed to all comfort, he must suppose that the cause of this lies in the fact that the sick person does not want to confess a deed on his conscience contrary to the impulse of the Holy Spirit. He should encourage him to ease his burdened conscience by a sincere confession, even before men. Ps. 32, 3-5: In this case, the preacher must naturally see to it that he is left alone with the patient.

§ 32. e.

The fifth rule for visiting the sick is given by Bidembach in the following words: "It is not advisable to make the sick, whose life and death are still in doubt, either too despondent and immediately deny them life, or to put them off too much and make dying too far; but because our life and death are in God's hands, it is best to keep it *in suspenso* (undecided).

to place everything on God's will. But it is not unnecessary, in the event of death, to always put a little more emphasis on dying.

so that the sick person may be all the more prepared to do so. For without this many only ever imagine the hope of living longer, and it is difficult to accustom them to thoughts of dying." (op. cit. p. 649. f.)

Note 1.

The sick person is to be reminded that every physical illness is not only always God's medicine for spiritual health, but also a messenger of death, even if it does not take place (Is. 38:1 ff.), and that the more seriously one therefore prepares for death, the greater the gain, even if one remains alive.

Note 2.

Seidel remarks: "It is a common prejudice among preachers that if they find the slightest appearance of improvement in a patient, they would not be bound to visit him. A conscientious teacher will observe the following in the case of sick persons who are likely to improve: 1. he will testify to them with as much love as earnestness that the prolongation of their life is of short duration, that God infallibly intends thereby to purify them still more from the impurities adhering to them, and that they must direct all their efforts to this final end. (2) They are promised (especially if they have not been in good health before) that they will "leave off one or other of the sinful habits which have hitherto been noticed in them," and so forth. (op. cit. p. 223.)

Note 3.

The preacher's farewell to the sick person is usually done with a heartfelt wish and with the promise, if possible, to return soon. Olearius remarks: "According to the patient's condition, a special short commemorative speech can be recommended to him, which encourages him to further meditation on what has been recited. (A. a. O. p. 846.)

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

Antithesis

on the thesis: "What is Theology?" in "Lehre und Wehre" Jahrgang 1868 (January, March, May, August, September, November, December).

Our readers no doubt remember the answer given by the Fathers of the Lutheran Church in the 1868 issue of this magazine to the question: What is theology? For theology is the teaching wrought by the Holy Spirit and derived from the Word of God.

The practical habitus (that is, the ability) of a man, created by means of prayer, study, and trial, to vividly recognize and communicate the truth revealed in the written Word of God for salvation, to justify, explain, apply, and defend it, in order to lead the sinful man to eternal blessedness through faith in JESUS CHRIST.

Now the learned gentlemen in Germany are not at all satisfied with this explanation. They know differently and, in their opinion, better. So let us present what they have set forth here in four antitheses and subject them to an evaluation.

1. Antithesis.

Theology is the science of religion.

2. Antithesis.

Their source is - ourselves.

3. Antithesis.

The means by which this (after) theology is gained is not: prayer, study and contestation, but the so-called "scientific method".

4. Antithesis.

The purpose of theology is not to lead sinful men to eternal blessedness through faith in Jesus Christ, but either to satisfy our instinct of knowledge, or to govern the public, or any other, at any rate an earthly one.

We will now explain and evaluate these antitheses, one after the other. So the

1. Antithesis was: Theology is the science of religion.

Note 1.

This was the opinion of Joh. G. Walch. The knowledge of God, he says (Einleitung in die dogm. Gottesgelahrtheit. Jena 1749. 8°. p. 4.) is a doctrine; or also: a science of those things which belong to religion. By religion, of course, the old gentleman did not mean any, but the true one. Similarly Liebner (Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche. Leipzig 1848. vol. 1. p. 20. 21.) and Luthard (Compendium of Dogmatics. Leipz. 1865. 8°. p. 2.).

So a science is theology. But perhaps it is permissible to ask first: what is to be understood by science? For our dear compatriots on the other side of the Atlantic sea have a strange way of using all sorts of crooked and glittering expressions to describe people.

in confusion. Science means nothing else than: Knowledge. "I had science of this conspiracy," they say. That is: I knew about it. And in Schiller's Maid of Orleans, King Charles asks the wonder-girl, "Thou standest my face to-day for the first time; whence comes this science to thee?" (Act 1. Scene 10.). He means: this knowledge that I am the king. Just so Göthe speaks: "Not art and science alone, patience is needed in the work. A quiet mind is busy for years; only time makes the fine ferment strong." (Faust, Theil 1. Hexenküche. Göthe's Werke XI, 100.) He wants to say: Knowledge and skill alone do not do it; patience must be added. Therefore Kaltschmidt quite correctly explains science by knowledge, coherent knowledge. (Sprachvergleichendes Wörterbuch. Leipzig 1839. 8. page 805.) After all, friendship also means being a friend, and enmity means being an enemy. We could still cite a legion of explanatory examples (Buhlschaft -buhlen, Ritterschaft - Ritter sein, Luther in the translation of Isa. 40, 2, etc.), but I think it is enough. Of course, one will object that the final syllable -schaft also forms collective (p, j. collective names). Thus by the citizenship of a city one understands: all its citizens, by the Jews: all Jews, even by knighthood sometimes: all knights. Well! And not only that, but some of the nouns on -schaft even mean both: the activity of their root word and a collection of individuals. Luther uses the word friendship both in the sense of *amicitia* and for *familia*. He does the former, Prov. 17, 9, and the latter, Gen. 12, 1. - If, then, the term science is to be understood not only as knowledge, but also as the sum of all that is known, we are satisfied. Only nothing else in the flesh! -

But that we explain correctly is shown by every connection in which the word science enters with other words. What is natural science but our knowledge, or the sum of our knowledge of nature? But, one objects, knowledge must be orderly in order to deserve the name of science: science. Ordered, if you like. Only do not imagine that the concept of order results from the syllable -schaft. That would be as silly as Zwingli's opinion: the copula is here and there metaphorical. The concept of order clings to the: Wissen, not to the poor thing of Bildungssilbe. For we understand by: knowing no disordered retaining, but a purely but cognizing. Thus, then, theology is to be an (ordered) knowledge, or, for my sake, the sum of our (experiential) knowledge of right religion. Exceptionally wrong, though old Walch said so. Yes, not merely wrong, but downright pernicious. For this explanation tears knowledge from the will, the head from the heart. And yet both are equally interested in theology.

But in mineralogy it is quite proper to speak thus: "science of stones"; in zoology a ditto. Why, then, not also in theology? Answer: Because God is not an animal, nor a stone. Of camels and metals I can know without my other mental powers (to say nothing of the body) being in the least affected by them. But of God I can have no true knowledge that does not at the same time turn everything in me round and round; that does not at the same time kill my lusts, strike down my ambition, nay, completely change all my looking and thinking. For He is zealous and strong, a consuming fire. It is because of the nature of its object, then, that theology is not like the other "sciences"; it is because of the nature of this object, which is in the highest degree activ, which wants man entirely or not at all, which does not tolerate being looked at like a painting. That is why it is such a dangerous thing with theology. You can do zoology and get drunk every day while doing it; that can at best be combined. With theology it is different. If you do not want to resign from unrighteousness, leave it alone. Play with stones, or, if thou wilt, with plants. But play not with God; for he burneth thee to powder, that not a shred of thee remaineth. -

The heathen, of course, could have *theologiam with the* greatest tranquillity, as they had *astrologiam,* or any other -logiam; for their gods were of wood, and the cats sat on the heads of them (Baruch 6:21.). We do not.

Note 2.

Beck goes one step further. According to him, theology is not the science of the true (Lutheran), but in general: that of the Christian religion. (Introduction to the System of Christian Doctrine. Stuttgart 1838. 8°. (Introduction to the System of Christian Doctrine, Stuttgart, 1838, 8°. p. 48-50.) Pelt (Theologische Encyklopädie, Hamburg, 1843, 8°. p. 15-16.) judges similarly: "As a positive science, theology appears with a firmly pronounced character. The center, to which everything must refer that is to be regarded as the content of theology, is namely the kingdom of God or the organic revelation of God in the world as church. . .. Theology thus relates to religion and church as consciousness of life relates to life, theory to practice." Excellent! But which church does Mr. Pelt mean, and which Christianity Beck? For, as is well known, there is a rather extensive Roman, and even a Greek, Church. Is theology the knowledge of one of these special communities, or of all of them together?- But these gentlemen love to cloak themselves in general phrases, lest their erroneous belief should come to light. If only all those who speak of "Christianity" would always say in the first paragraph what they mean by it! Do you understand by it the way that God's word leads to the city with the

If you know the streets of gold, it is good. The (practical) knowledge of this way and the ability to show it to others - is, of course, theology. If, on the other hand, you understand by Christianity the "religion" which is founded by Christ and then has developed or will develop into a world region through v. Ammon, Feuerbach, and others, then the knowledge of it is not theology, but humbug. With the declaration: "Theology is the science of Christianity," therefore, little can be done. If any one means the Christianity of Scripture, let him say so. Then he will find that this Christianity engages not only the nerves of the head, but the whole man; then the much-vaunted science changes all by itself and most naturally into the *habitus practicus* again. If any one means another thing, let him keep it at bay. We leave this kind of "science" to persons of highly developed curiosity and superfluous time. In our theology we are dealing with immensely practical things, namely, heaven and hell.

Note 3.

"Theology is the science of religion in general (whether pagan or Christian)." It goes downhill more and more. First they make theology a mere knowledge, then they rob its object of its heart, and now they even cut out its flesh. There, of course, they retain nothing but a miserable skeleton. The great surgeon who has succeeded in this miraculous feat is called Bretschneider. He says in his Handbuch der Dogmatik, Reutlingen 1823, 8", vol. 1. p. 21: "More suitable for what is called theology (o how considerately expressed! one notices, Mr. Bretschneider is not particularly well disposed to the *ὑεός*), should be the word: Religionswissenschaft. The classification of theology may be determined entirely according to the classifications of religion, and one may distinguish a monotheistic, polytheistic, etc. Theology." Of religion itself, however, Mr. Bretschneider says, p. 13: it is knowledge and worship of God or the gods. Its origin is not to be derived from terrible natural phenomena alone (p. 14.). "The contemplation of the beauty and expediency of the world, the moral nature of man, the way of thinking of causality, and the inclination to the ideal, must have raised man to the idea of the Deity." Bretschneider then goes on to say, "The kinds of religion can be determined according to various grounds of classification: 1) According to the objects worshipped, and that either according to the quantity or the quality of the same. The quantity gives the division of religions into monotheism, dualism, and polytheism, according as one being, or two fundamental beings, one good and one evil, or finally several beings are acknowledged and worshipped as gods," and so on. And - wonderful! In Brerschneider's footsteps walk even men who in Germany are considered the most zealous advocates of biblical Christianity. Thus says Hahn,

Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, Leipzig 1828, 8°, p. 38. 39: "Religion is the object of theology, as God is the object of religion. According to the usage which has become dominant since the twelfth century through Petrus Abälardus, theology (Gottesgelahrtheit) is: Religious Science or Theory of Religion and appropriates all the merits (!) of a well-ordered system. Its purpose is to present all the individual doctrines of religion clearly and definitely. It is accordingly: scientific and learned exposition of the doctrines of religion." Yes, this definition is at present, at least in Germany, the prevailing one. People are afraid to depart from it; for he who departs from it is branded as unscientific.

Well! But we are not alone unscientific, but we declare: This definition is invented by Satan. For it readily puts the one living God, beside whom there is no other, on a level with the accursed grimaces which the heathen worship. One really believes oneself transported to the temple of Alexander Severus: There are thirty or forty idols, green, blue, and red, among them also Christ. (*Lampridius invita Alex*. c. 29.) But the science of these idols is - theology. Fie on this theology! May it remain to those who believe neither in the living God, nor in Hermes Kyllenios. Those who have an ounce of faith left will turn from it with contempt. Herr Feuerbach and his may always say: as there is a science of poems: poetics, so there is one of nonsensical ideas: theology. Whoever, on the other hand, has felt the wrathfulness of the living God and his mercy after it, will bite off his tongue before he puts the Creator of heaven and earth in the same line with idols for even a quarter of a minute. For what resemblance has the living God to these wretched puppets? They have mouths, and speak not; they have noses, and smell not; and the priests keep their temples safe, lest they be stolen by robbers. But it is a strange trick of the devil to declare the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel to be one among many, and to bring this declaration at once into the definition of theology, so that men stumble at it before they enter. For whose mouth would such a declaration have been appropriate, for the mouth of Ahab or for the mouth of Elijah? Ahab would certainly have rejoiced in it. For he would thereby have been enabled to "scientifically justify" the "point of view" of his wife Jezebel, which of course was also his own. But Elias would hardly have agreed to this classification of the "religions" according to the "quantity of the objects worshipped," even at the risk of being stoned for it by her majesty. Hear, Israel, the LORD our God is one God; Him alone shalt thou worship, and none more! This is the only tenable theology; all else is abomination. -

But it is especially wonderful how Mr. Hahn (and thousands after him) acts as if nothing at all had happened between Mr. Abälard and himself. One listens and is astonished: "According to the usage of language which has become dominant (!) since the twelfth century through Petrus Abälardus, theology is: religious science." So the trifle of 700 years which elapsed between Abelard and Hahn does not come into consideration here. Nor does the fact that John Duns, a rather famous scholastic, and eight thousand Minorites taught approximately the opposite. Much less does it disturb such great minds that a certain so-called Reformation also occurred or is said to have occurred in the said seven hundred years, and that all persons who were involved in it condemned the said Abelardian invention as a false and godless dream. All this is as if it did not exist for spirits who dwell in the ether of pure science.

> Namely - in the serene regions, Where the pure forms dwell, No longer rushes the miserable stream.

What Luther! What Chemnitz and Gerhard! Here we are. We university professors are the church, like Louis XIV is the state. We have **raised** theology to the rank of a science, and we know well what we want.

Well, well! Let her hang aloft till she be rotten. We'll go our way below in silence. Our goal is the city where God dries our tears. We'll not need your doll on the journey.

Note 4.

"Theology is science in general." That is, it is not the science of one or many religions, not a science of experience at all; but it is a pure, that is, speculative science, nay, absolute science itself. The inventor of this standpoint is Hegel. Rosenkranz, Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften, ed. 2nd, Halle 1845, 8°, p. X, forms it more precisely: "Since absolute truth, as the absolute certainty of itself, is the concept of science, in this concept philosophy must be identical with theology, theology with philosophy.... (XI:) Only this identical relation is the true one; it overcomes the one-sided opposition of the positions indicated above. (XIII:) As Christian, theology makes the same claims as philosophy to state the ultimate determinations of religion in general. Its content is thoroughly of an absolute nature. Since, then, both regions deal with the same object, and since it is to be absolutely comprehended from both sides, - without which comprehension science would not correspond to its purpose of being science, - philosophy and theology cannot be mutually exclusive in theology as such.

behave in a closing manner against each other." Similarly Marheineke and the other Hegelians.

What shall we say to this? Old Walch still left theology its object: true religion; Beck and Pelt still left the skeleton: Christianity; even Bretschneider still acted as if the object were there, although it was only the shadow of his skeleton. Here, however, everything has disappeared except the shadow. How could it be otherwise? After all, Messrs. Rosenkranz and Marheineke do not believe a single pin of what is written in the Bible. Since, however, they need an object for their pretended science, but have thrown all the real objects through the window, they substitute certain expressions that have some resemblance to the escamotized objects: absolute religion, absolute being, the idea, God, the absolute. Like gamblers who have spent all their money, yet still play with arithmetic pennies; or like children perform historical tragedies with paper dolls. For - seriously speaking - what is the Absolute? that is, the thing which is free from all finite determinations? Simply nothing. Red fluid exists, wholesome fluid too, even sweet and thick; fluid in itself, or: absolute fluid does not. Take away from a thing all its properties, and it is no longer there. A true religion exists, even a holy one; even false ones exist, but "religion in itself" does not. If this poor Absolute is even deprived of the property of being a thing, the last one it possessed, then "nothing" remains; and so pure a "nothing" that it might well be called by the expression, "purely nothing" or "absolutely nothing. And this is the object of theology! Happy theology! how infinitely little trouble it costs to learn thee! That is why the Lazzaronis of Naples are your best students.

And the idea is in the same happy case. The pagan Plato dreamed it. And afterwards Christians came and concluded: it must exist somewhere, otherwise Plato would certainly not have dreamed of it. Poor idea! Let yourself be put back into your puppet-box. Now the dear children are playing monkey-comedy and don't need yours. Perhaps after Carl Vogt's death someone will write books about you again.

2. Antithesis.

The source of theology is - ourselves.

Note 1.

Namely our reason.

Here we now meet our old friend Bretschneider again. The very title of his famous Glaubenslehre reveals his point of view. "Die religiöse Glaubenslehre nach der Vernunft und Offenbarung für denkende Leser dargestellt. Halle 1846. 8°." And to make his ouellette desirable to everyone, he shows right at the beginning

with great earnestness the ground of the alleged depravity of reason (p. 7. ff.). "This accusation - so the mighty man clamors - this accusation of incompetence, which was brought against reason, was based partly on a dogma which one believed to have found in the divine revelation of sacred Scripture, partly on the history of that which mere reason had accomplished, and on the lacking character of reason in the generality or general validity of its utterances/' (p. 7.) Dr. Chr. Fr. v. Ammon, in the famous book, "Die Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion, eine Ansichtder höheren Dogmatik. Leipzig 1836. 8°." View of higher dogmatics! What does that mean? Does the Doctor think that it is a view of higher dogmatics that Christianity must be developed into a world religion? Or do the same people call his book a view of higher dogmatics, as one speaks of a view of St. Louis or St. Charles? Be that as it may, however, one of the main propositions of higher dogmatics is at any rate this (Vol. 1, p. 60.): "By this single, but irrefragable remark, the general or ideal primacy of reason in the affairs of religion is irrevocably proved from the original institution of our minds; reason ought and must first freely and self-actively conceive of God according to its own idea, . . before it can rise to the reflection of a divine revelation, and from this again infer its holy author."

As much as the newer speculative theology loves to affect a certain contempt for the old nationalism, it stands on the very same ground. This is clearly evident in the theological encyclopedia by Rosenkranz cited above (p. 3. 9. ff.). It is perhaps doubted here and there by Richard Rothe. But even by him it becomes evident, if one considers the peculiar demand which he makes upon theological speculation. For it is to derive its science from an original date (Ethics 1:12). This primordial datum, however, is none other than: human consciousness (p. 14.), and that in its absolute purity, i. e., after complete abstraction from every definite object and content of it (Thilo, Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der modernen spekulativen Theologie. Leipzig 1851. 8°. S. 116. ff.). It is just the same rattlesnake, only with a new skin. "Our reason is the spring, there create *theologia*." Good reason, what thou shalt be all! Even in divine things thou art the source, and yet art not even in human! For- Let us but observe. Do we smell with reason, or see with it ? I think not; but when our eye has brought us the colour of the flower, and our nose its perfume, our reason comes and says, behold, this is a rose. So then she is the instrument that we may join and order. We conclude with her. Even the general propositions are not drawn from reason, but from experience; reason

has done nothing more than the formula for it. Or where did I get the rather well-known sentence: All men are mortal? But nowhere else than from experience. For because I have seen that my father died and my grandfather too; because I have heard that the people before us had to go the same way, I write in a little corner of my memory with the pen of reason: all men are mortal. And even the so-called first truths of reason, such as the proposition of the contradiction τύ αυτό *αμα ύπάρχειν re χαΐ μη ύπάρχειν αδύνατον τω αύτω xal χατά το αυτ*ό), did not arise otherwise. For the domain of reason, in truth, extends no line further than the domain of experience. And now this maid, who has done enough, if she manages well that which is given to her, - misses herself to play queen. We are indeed far from disregarding a gift of God, one so noble in particular; but we are just as far away and even more distant from the foolish presumption of wanting not only to smell with the nose, but also to eat and hear at the same time. So let it remain so, and it will probably also - in spite of Hegel and Rothe - always remain so: In the field of secular science, sensual experience is the fountain; on the ground of theology, God's word.

Were it not for God's revelation in nature, we would have no mineralogy, whether we heated our reason to bursting point; and were we lacking God's Word, there would be no theology, in spite of Hegel and all the Hegelingen. For as little as all the mineralogists put together are able to create a stone, so little can all the "scientific theologians" put together add a single jot to God's being.

And what strange results come to the gentlemen who dig for the truths of God in the dark shaft of their sinful reason! One brings to light clay, another smashed bricks, the third even fool's gold. No two products are alike, and yet each claims to have found the philosopher's stone. At last they come to blows, and it will be best for us not to disturb them in their brawl.

Note 2.

Or our religious feeling.

The most viable variation on the old tune now. Let us hear its principal composer. "The doctrine of faith," says Schleiermacher (Der christliche Glaube. Reutlingen 1828. 8. vol. 1. p. 20.), "rests on two things: first, on the endeavor to represent the excitements of the Christian pious mind in doctrine, and then on the endeavor to bring what is expressed as doctrine into exact connection." As the object of Christian doctrine, then, Schleiermacher names: certain excitements, and as the fountain in which to find them: the pious mind. For this reason, in the very next section, he designates as the most important precept, according to which every dogmatics must be laid out, (that:)

"to present nothing as doctrine which has not been in the whole of pious excitements, of which the doctrinal edifice is to be the image; "who also to include in the doctrinal edifice all that is found in it, straightly or inclusively." (Ibid. p. 22.)

This position contains two fatal errors. The first is this: Schleiermacher scamotizes Christian piety and defines pagan piety instead. Pagan piety exists in feeling, for no other reason than that the pagans lack a living God whom they can recognize and rely on. For this reason, of course, nothing remains to them but a "feeling of dependence on a higher being, determined at best by the consciousness of sin." Christian piety, on the other hand, or Christian faith according to the Scriptures, is not a feeling, but knowledge and confidence. And now this "theologian" comes and, without uttering a syllable, confounds Christian piety with dear heathen piety! I do not know which one should be more astonished at: at the sorcerer's forehead, or at the foolishness of the public. For all this has happened before the eyes of all Christian Germany. The simplicity of John Brown, who had a watch of Confect conjured into his vest pocket in place of his golden one, is nothing at all compared to this. These children of understanding sit there, holding in their hands the gold that their fathers laboriously acquired for them; then the great miracle man comes along, takes away their sovereigns at the drop of a hat, and gives them miserable pennies in exchange. And the poor little ones - smile; for the old gold pieces were not so bright as the new ones. Is it not to weep bloody tears over them? Throw away the pennies of reckoning! Your piety is false, and your gods are idols. No man is saved by dependence, but we are saved by faith alone. And faith is knowledge and assurance.

But even if Schleiermacher had not played this quid pro quo (x for u), if he had understood by Christian piety what the apostles and prophets understood by it, his position would still be wrong, for even our faith is not the source of the truth of God. What then? Allow us a preliminary question before we answer. Are there not two kinds of truth, sensual and supersensual? Both come from God; the sensual He gives us by the means of nature, the supersensual by His written Word. There it is the senses, that we may receive; here it is faith. As little as our senses can be said to be the source of sensual truth, so little is faith in the supersensible sphere. But faith is but the bucket, to draw from the fountain of the word of God, (Heb. 11:3.) as the senses are, from the fountain of nature. The ancients with good reason distinguished between the *opyavov δοτιχόν* (the means by which God gives)
and that (the means by which we take) carefully distinguished.

We do well, indeed, not to mix the two together again; for in the sphere of heavenly truth the δργανον *δοτιχόν is* the word, the ληπτιχόν our faith. Now how can any one be so wrong as to regard his δργανον *ληπτιχόν* as the treasure-house out of which flows his sustenance! This would be just as foolish as if a general did not regard the state treasury as the source of his *salary,* but his servant, because the said individual is the person who is accustomed to collect the salary.

So it will probably remain: the source of all truth is God, His two treasure houses are: Nature and the Word. There the worldly wise man draws, here the theologian and the Christian.

Note 3.

Or our conscience.

The inventor of this point of view is the insane Holstein candidate Knuzcn. He brought his "Princip" to light in a special treatise in 1673 and was refuted by Musaeus. (*J. A. Schmidt, Sagitarianae introductionis in historiam ecclesiasticam tom. II. Jenae* 1718. p. 678.) In his footsteps has followed Schenkel. (D. Schenkel, Christliche Dogmatik vom Standpuncte des Gewissens aus dargestellt. 1858 ff. 2 vols.)

On the surface, this system seems a turn for the better. For is not the vivid emphasis on conscience the first step from arid theory to fresh practice? Yes, if it were so! But it does not even remotely occur to the gentlemen to strive after a *habitus practicus ' per verbum Dei ad vitam aeternam,* but they only push conscience forward to supplant Scripture. For once they have obtained that theology does not draw from Scripture, but from their, that is, the theologians', conscience, they eliminate four fifth parts of Christian doctrine with the very easiest effort. Personal devil? Does not exist in our conscience, therefore also not in *rerum natura*; as is further to be read in Schenkel's Dogmatics.

The conscience has its own territory. It tells us what is good and what is evil; it warns us of the deed and punishes us afterwards. But even here, even in its own realm, it is not absolutely infallible. For example, it forbids Professor Schenkel to eat his wife, but not the Prince of Dahomey. If it is to judge rightly, it must always receive instruction from the written word of God. For sin is not merely: "what conscience forbids," but: "what runs contrary to God's word" (1 John 3:4: *ή άμαρτία Ιστίν η άνομία*.).

Note 4.

But even such faithful and rightly revered witnesses of truth as Philippi do not break decisively enough with the traditional errors in this area. At least in the first edition of the Prolegomena it says

of his Dogmatics, p. 86: "According to what we have discussed in the first chapter, we will not be able to understand dogmatics as a description of pious feeling, of the Christian state of mind, but only as a development of the content of revelation as it is reflected in the believing human spirit. The source, therefore, from which dogmatics must draw, is the reason of the dogmatizing subject, enlightened by revelation." So it is the subject after all! It is really to despair.

Poor, poor theology! your physicians are really killing you. One says: thou shalt draw from the "unenlightened" reason; another: from the enlightened; a third directs thee to the religious mind; a fourth to the conscience; but all to the wretched maggot-sack called man. I really fear you will fare badly with all four. For how should a man know anything of heavenly things! And if he knows anything, he certainly has not got it from anywhere else but from God's word. Why then not go straight to God's word? I ask: why?

Once upon a time a traveller passes through a small town in Tyrol. In the middle of the market a clear spring gushes, just at the feet of the Crucifixus. Around the fountain, however, the street boys lie and struggle to drink through small pipes. One has a lime pipe, apparently a fragment of a tobacco pipe; the other a wooden, self-fabricated one; the third a straw. But the water was always impure, whether it came from tobacco or elsewhere. "But, children!" cried the traveller at last, "what is the use of all this frippery? Fresh your mouths to the spring!"

So it is with our countrymen over there. The spring, God's word, bubbles up within the range of their lips, but they cannot decide to drink, for that would not be "scientific". Therefore: a pipe here! a kingdom for a pipe! May it at least let through little water, if only it has something special in appearance or smell.

Note 5.

Modern theology is a proteus. No sooner do we think we have come to the end of their strange transformations than they conjure up a new one. That God's Word and God's Word alone is the fountain that gives life, they do not want to believe. It is to be man by all means. First they say: his reason, then: his feeling, then: his conscience, then: his life of faith, finally: "half the Bible and half the inner light in our hearts." Dörner asserts the last, of course not in common-sense words. The dear theologians on the other side of the sea have rather a kind of masonic Latin which only the initiated understand. In this secret language it says: "Protestantism has two principles, a material and a formal one; the formal one is the Holy Scripture, the material one justification. Scripture, the material is justification by faith." By "justification by faith," however, one did not mean the well-known doctrine of it

The principle of our church is not to be understood as the one found in the Epistle to the Romans, but rather as our inner experience. (Dörner, Das Princip unserer Kirche nach dem inneren Verhältniß seiner zwei Seiten. 1841. History of Protestantism. 1868.) Likewise Julius Müller, only that he places the so-called material principle above the formal. (MS. Prolegomena to Dogmatics. Halle, winter term 1843-44. § 14.) Invented in an uncommonly sensible way for the benefit and piety of the Prussian Union. For if God's written Word were acknowledged as the only source of theology, it would follow: that only one doctrine is valid. For God's word, like every honest man's word, has one meaning, and not two. But since the union consists precisely in the fact that two doctrines are valid and not one, two principles are also invented. For one places next to the fountain of Israel, from which the Lutheran Church has always drawn, the inner light of the Quakers, and now claims that theology has to draw from both. But so that the Prussian Lutherans do not become head-shy, one says instead of: inner light, "justification by faith".

Does such a procedure need any criticism? Not for us Bushmen. For we are so whimsically clumsy that we say: Either theology draws from inner experience, for my sake from justification, and then we become Methodists - for which there is convenient opportunity everywhere here; or it draws from the Bible, and then we remain Lutherans. At the most, a General Synod Lutheran who had a Methodist wife could fall for Dorner's dream here. Not other persons.

3. Antithesis.

The means by which this (after) theology is gained is not: prayer, study and moistening, but the so-called scientific method.

Note 1.

With the Mormons, of course, it is the imagination. But it makes no difference whether the much-vaunted scientific method is used for this purpose. For in the main, Rothe's appendix agrees with the Anabaptists, namely, in that they exclude the cooperation of the living God in obtaining their alleged theology - whether in the Word, or whether by chastisement.

Note 2.

For as these dark men believe that they have discovered the source of all theology in themselves, so they also find the all-sufficient method in the storehouses of their intellect. Thus says Bretschneider (Syst. Entwickelung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe. ED. 3. Reutlingen 1826. 8°. S. 39.): "In form, religious science, as a science, must be a system. The system is opposed to the aggregate, the multitude, where one stands next to the other without connection and unity, and is, in strict

Theological speculation, in the sense of the word, is an epitome of propositions, all of which are subordinated to a supreme principle (that is, a general proposition, in which the other propositions are contained as corollaries, and which is therefore called the principle), and are derived from it in a coherent, distinct order." According to Rothe, too, theological speculation proceeds from the very simplest fact. "Suspending all other possible data of consciousness and leaving them for the time being undecided, it constructs the universe out of that alone, from the primordial datum, by virtue of the dialectic immanent in it." (Rothe in Scheele, Die trunkene Wissenschaft. Berlin 1867. 80. p. 110.) And of this belladonna they have almost all eaten. Thus v. Hofmann declares at the close of the introduction to his so-called Proofs of the Scriptures (Nördlingen 1852. Vol. J. p. 32.): "I take my departure from the above-established simplest and most general statement of Christianity, that the same is the personal fellowship of God and mankind mediated in Jesus Christ. I am bound to take from this statement everything that is to become the content of the whole doctrine to be established, without my being allowed to include and use for its execution anything experiential or historical that is not contained in it." Cf. also Pelt, Theologische Encyklopädie, Hamburg 1843, 8°, p. 17.

So not "piecemeal." At least that is clearly spoken. St. Paul and his fellow apostles recognized in bits and pieces, but these new prophets recognized completely. Our knowledge is piecemeal," says 1 Cor. 13:9, "and our prophecy is piecemeal. But when the perfect shall come, then the piecemeal shall cease. This perfect thing is supposed to have come with Bretschneider's dogmatics! I believe, however, that verse 11 rather fits Bretschneider's dogmatics: "When I was a child, I spoke like a child, and was wise like a child, and had childish ideas. For what is the opinion of a complete development of truth from a principle but the dream of a boy? God once revealed to us no more than eight or nine of his secrets; he who wants more must invent. And this is what the medieval scholastics did to a considerable extent; Herr Rothe & Comp. with no less zeal, though with less luck. For set all against all, the speculative system of St. Thomas is far more Christian than that of Richard. Thomas far more Christian than that of Richard Rothe. Even the Holy Trinity, which the Scholastic professes, the latter denies. Christian theology has a tangible object at all, like medicine; it is not speculative at all. This kind of speculation, developing systems from principles, is rather pagan. Its end is also never: knowledge, but always: fiction. Remember the father of speculation, Plato. Can there be a more foolish dream than that of his "ideas"? I think we leave it to the heathen to deceive themselves with such images; we really have better things to do than to "stand on the ladder and stare at the sun.

And if our reason were at least healthy! But alas, it is sick and must be regulated by the word of God and the cross, lest it go astray. Those who do not believe in their illness may be taught by Spinoza. As is well known, Spinoza was a Jew who believed neither in the Bible nor in the Talmud; and yet he had so much sense for factual truth that he remarked that our reason is enslaved by our passions (Spinoza, Ethic, lib. IV. de servitute humana). How, then, will one perform with a paralyzed hand what he is not even able to perform with a healthy one?

And if our reason itself were sound, healthy, and not limited, it would still not make a theologian. The will must also be involved. And no one can get it right without God, with the double hammer of word and need.

4. antithesis.

The purpose of theology is not to lead the sinful man to eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, but either to satisfy our instinct for knowledge, or to govern the public, or any other, at any rate an earthly one.

Note 1.

"The purpose of theology is to satisfy the instinct of knowledge." That is Rothe's opinion. Yes, that is what all those believe who pass theology off as a "science." Also the Herzog'sche Encyklopädie (Vol. XV. p. 749.; the article is by Pelt). Even Harleß, in his Theological Encyclopedia, Nuremberg 1837, 8°, p. 26, 27: "As every scientific discipline is the product of a historical development of human knowledge, so also the need of theological knowledge is not to be derived and comprehended from the nature of religion itself, but only from the historical development of the church, from which scientific theology itself has arisen. The necessity of theological knowledge lies, according to its potentiality, in the nature of the rational spirit itself, which, what it possesses, is not merely to have as a given possession, but is impelled to set it down again as its now own movement and as absolute truth at the same time.... .. Thus it is evident that the scientific mediation of the certainty of faith through theological knowledge corresponds to a general need of the church, which it is the task of individuals to satisfy." Wonderful saints, you, in your scientific balloon above! The poor earth with its sinners who are to be saved has disappeared from your gaze; heaven and hell, too. Around you is nothing but the pure ether of science. And it grows thinner and thinner. If only you do not one day dry up for lack of the love of life! -

A good corrective to this strange aberration, by the way, is the be-

The first is the consideration of another so-called "science", for example medicine. By this was formerly understood also a *habitus practicus, the* purpose of which was the restoration of (human) health. Then came people who said: Not thus, but medicine is a science, its purpose the satisfaction of our instinct of knowledge with regard to the symptoms of disease and their medicines. From this "principle" there developed professors of medicine who had never cured or even attempted to cure a sick person. Whether these persons, otherwise certainly most venerable, can teach others what they themselves do not understand, we dare not decide here. But if scientific development continues in this way, the few physicians who are still around will soon leave their sickbeds to write treatises on the principle of the cell. The great "scientific fact" that our great-grandmothers were chimpanzees is - for example - much more important than the death of some old woman who lies ill with pneumonia.

In theology it is often already so. If one were to make the suggestion to David Strauss that a "sinful man can be led to eternal blessedness through faith in Jesus Christ," he would undoubtedly regard it as a bad joke and reject it.

And just from this springs a whole stream of ruin. For when one has first forgotten the purpose of an art or a business, business and art go to ruin. How, for instance, would it have been possible to store up such a mass of folly as the late Rothe did, if he had kept the purpose of all theology ever present? One is truly reminded, in the reading of such speculative books, of the cloud-cuckoo-home of the Athenians in the Birds of Aristophanes. It is a city in the air. Made of wind, the wind carries it away. Fortunately for us, America is the worst ground for it... For if any community here were asked to pay a thousand dollars a year to a professor to spin science, our farmers would politely thank him for it.

Note 2.

According to Schleiermacher, the ultimate purpose of all theology is, "the government and advancement of the church" (Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith. 1. p. 16.).

This is, of course, quite practical. If Schleiermacher had only wanted to understand it as the leading of the congregation into the new Jerusalem! But he never did, since, judging from his writings, he believed in a new Jerusalem as little as in a falling of the moon (Der christliche Glaube. 2. pp. 553-561.). Rather, as his brief account of theological study (§ 5.) shows, he understood by the aforementioned guidance and encouragement: earthly things on earthly ground and for earthly purposes.

Well - what a theology with earthly purposes is supposed to do, is able to

I can understand an illumination of the doctrine of interest on money according to evangelical principles, etc., provided that the salaries of professors are quite high. But why a church in need of leadership should continue to exist if there is nothing in Jerusalem, I cannot understand. For a congregation that would appoint a pastor under such difficult circumstances would have to be declared insane. Can't you keep a negro for *$500 a year*? And is not the work of a full-grown negro in the field or on the wharf a thousand times more productive than the idle talk of a *preacher* about imaginary things once or twice a week? It's not at all pleasant to be scolded by anybody; but to pay the brawler is a little too bad.

If, therefore, Schleiermacher's position should really one day attain general recognition, there will certainly still be persons who want to lead, but hardly any who are inclined to be led continually. For truly, because there is a blessedness, therefore there is also a church; and because there is a church, therefore there is also a theology. None without the other.

An Illumination of the Doctrine of Money Interest according to Protestant Principles, together with an Appendix: Summarischer Auszug der J. Gerhard's doctrine of usury.

By A. G. Doehler, Pastor.

(Available from Joach. Birkner, New York 92 William St.)

We can only rejoice in getting to know in the author not only a connoisseur, but also a disciple of our I. Gerhard; we only regret that he also follows in his teacher's footsteps where the latter becomes entangled in an internal contradiction and thereby refutes his theory of usury itself. As a God-fearing theologian, Gerhard readily admits that love, as the *directrix* and *moderatrix* of all our actions, commands us to remit interest to those who have gained nothing with the capital, and even to renounce the capital if it has been lost through no fault of the debtor; Nevertheless, he considers the contract of loan on interest to be permissible, which nevertheless expresses the very opposite of what love commands; for the contract of loan in its usual form takes no account of the situation of the debtor, but secures interest and capital for the creditor (so far as, of course, human security can be spoken of), leaving, on the other hand, loss and danger to the debtor alone. Is this not a contradiction? If a kind creditor does not always make use of the strictness of the contract of loan, this is indeed an acknowledged leniency, but it does not in itself cancel out the strictness of the contract of loan.

Indeed, the duty of charity, which is commanded by natural law and confirmed by Christ and his apostles, is the most convincing and the chief proof against lending out of interest. Charity demands that a contract with one's neighbor be a just one, i.e., one that does justice to one's neighbor.

The contract of loan is one that favours the creditor at the expense or risk of the debtor. The contract of loan, however, is one that favors the creditor at the expense or risk of the debtor, and so on. The author will not be able to avoid the force of this syllogism. This proof will be even clearer if, for example, we contrast it with the *contractus societatis.* Its principle is equality, equal profit, equal loss, equal danger; the principle of the contract of loan is inequality. This proof, taken from the law of nature and confirmed in the New Testament, will then throw an explanatory light on the individual passages in the Old Testament that deal with usury. It is claimed that the Mosaic laws concerning usury were only police laws, affecting the Jews, or that they were given only with regard to the poor. Without this main proof, taken from the natural law, it would, of course, be possible, without prejudice to sound hermeneutical principles, to explain these passages in this way; but our aforementioned main proof having been made, these passages cannot be understood in any other way than that they are confirmations, applications, and exemplifications of the general natural law. In the same way, we admit that if the contract of lending on interest were permitted by the law of nature, the New Testament passages on lending could be interpreted, without violating sound hermeneutics, in such a way that they would not be opposed to lending against moderate interests to wealthy businessmen. But because the contract of lending on interests is contrary to the law of nature, there remains no other lawful lending than lending without interests.

These cursory remarks, without going into all the details of the pamphlet, will suffice to put the actual *status controversiae in perspective.* The honored author will not be angry with us if we have openly expressed our convictions, which differ from his own. We are guided by no other desire than that, just as we are one in fundamental articles of faith, we should also become one in this doctrine of usury, which so closely touches the Christian life. Let us not close our minds to it, and hope to God that he will crown with glorious blessing the search for the full truth which we have continued in prayer, with holy earnestness, in untiring patience, without bitterness and passion. B-m.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From the Presbyterian Church. Recently the Presbytery of Monongahela, during a meeting held in Pittsburg, excommunicated and deposed Rev. Jas. Prestley, D. D., because the same had married elsewhere while his wife, who was divorced from him (for his fault), was still living.

Free or state schools. In the "Evangelist" we read: "The ***Reformed Church Messenger*** and the ***Christian Intelligencer*** recently again spoke very strongly in favor of parochial schools and against the present free school system.

They say that religion is indeed favoured by some teachers in the free schools, but that this is by no means general and that there can be no question of systematic religious instruction.

How a professor of the Augustana Synod judges us in their "Norske Lutheraner" and how our dear Norwegian brothers defend us. In the "Maanedstidende" of April 1, we read the following: "In the third volume of the 'Norske Lutheraner' No. 2, Prof. Weenaas writes: 'As is well known, there are two currents running through the Lutheran Church in America. On the one hand, we have the Missouri Synod and those who follow it. Their distinguishing character is a traditional doctrinaire direction, which derives its testimony of Christ and His kingdom primarily from ecclesiastical tradition, especially from the dogmatics of the seventeenth century, at any rate with partial disregard of the Holy Scriptures. The authors of the book, however, are not interested in the doctrines of the church. As their attention seems to be directed entirely to pure doctrine, to its presentation in the system, where link fits link with mechanical precision, without the practical side of Christianity as a new life, as an absolutely new form of existence, being duly emphasized, so they also seem to be so devoted to their supposedly pure doctrine that they have almost forgotten 1 Cor. 13:12, namely, that all our knowledge here is only piecemeal, and that everything, thus also the knowledge of Christian truth, is in a process of development from clarity to greater clarity. It therefore constricts faith in the laced bosom of theological views and dogmatic definitions, whereby faith so easily degenerates into a dead, stiff adherence to what the fathers have handed down and taught, into a haughty looking down on others who cannot share their views in everything and anything, into a sweet and reckless contentiousness, which is little befitting a fighter for Christ*. What shall we say to this judgment of Prof. Weenaas on the Missouri Synod? He raises the hard accusation against it, that it has made human tradition the source and guide of its doctrine, and has substituted it, at least in part, for the holy Scriptures. Scripture. Whence hath he this? Surely he has not been in this country much more than half a year, and is already so ready with his judgment? Those who know the Missouri Synod also know that if anything is peculiar to this Synod, it is just this, that in all things it follows the Scriptures as the only source and rule, and builds only on them and not on men. Had Prof. Weenaas studied the writings of the Missourians, had he made himself acquainted with some of their older congregations, with some of their teaching institutions and teachers, he would certainly not have passed such a judgment. But he has probably drawn his knowledge more from impure sources than, for example, from the editor of the 'Norske Lutheraner,' whom we have already had to accuse publicly several times of false testimony, and who nevertheless continues to bring his neighbor falsely into an evil rumor. Or is it that the great light of the Iowa Synod is his source? This Synod has long been the most vehement opponent of the Missourians. A portion of its members have lately been traveling all over the place to win confederates against the Missourians, and were at Paxton last fall. Their main erroneous doctrine at present is their doctrine of the 'open questions,' i.e., the assertion that there are Christian doctrines of faith, such as the doctrine of Sunday, of the millennial kingdom, in which the Scriptures are not clear enough, but about which the 'church' (i.e., men) must first determine what is to be believed about it, or else one cannot come to certainty about it. Consequently they want to set man's judgment above God's word, while the Missourians also assert against them the prestige and clarity of Scripture. Surely a simple sense of justice should have told Prof. Weenaas that he must not believe these people until he had heard the other part, and much less should he have brought his hasty judgment before the public without having duly done so." -Thanks to the dear Norwegian brethren for this faithful saving of honor. How zealous they are to promote the best of the Church with us in the same way, let it serve as a new proof that on the 5th of March a numerous meeting of members of the same took place at Madison, Wis. to discuss the establishment of institutions of higher education.

and that a committee was immediately appointed to take preparatory steps for the establishment of a higher Norwegian-American school. Furthermore, the Publishing Commission of the Norwegian Synod has already taken steps to establish its own synodal printing press in order to better supply its dear congregations with good and uniform church and school books, and has also appointed its own committee to promote this purpose. God bless the dear brethren in their faithful undertaking. C.

In California many inhabitants of the Caucasian race do not want to allow the Chinese to be taught Christianity. The Methodist church in Snn Jose was burned to the ground by arsonists because Christian instruction was being given to the Chinese. The Sunday school superintendent has to guard his house and barn against arsonists. The Methodists are nevertheless making efforts to proselytize among the Chinese in the coastal states. (Christi. Bolsch.)

Alaska. We have recently reported that the cession of Alaska to the Der. States, some difficulties arose concerning the situation of the Greek clergy there. The Holy Synod was asked for information. The decision has been made. According to this decision, an independent bishopric for Alaska will replace the previous vicariate of New Archangel, which was dependent on the bishop of Kamchatka, and whose seat has been moved to San Francisco for climatic and traffic reasons. The newly consecrated bishop appoints all clergy of his diocese and recruits them from the Russian clergy; he himself is under the synod, to which he has to send reports and whose orders he has to obey in the administration of church affairs. (Ibid.)

Chinese Night School. A free night school for Chinese has been established in New York. It is attended by an average of 50 Chinese. A Chinese woman, educated in Hong Kong, who now keeps a boarding house in New York, and who reads and speaks English quite well, acts as interpreter and reads from a Chinese Bible on Sundays. The Chinese there are described as industrious, housekeepers, clean and eager to learn. (Ibid.)

Community schools. Among the resolutions of a conference of the Protestants (Albrechtsleute) of April 22 of this year, the 5th and 6th read as follows: "Resolved, That the establishment of parochial schools is a need among us, which is more and more recognized, and we therefore recommend that such be established wherever practicable; also that more attention be paid to the State schools, and that instruction be given, wherever possible, in the German language. Resolved, That catechetical instruction be more seriously and systematically pursued than has hitherto been generally done."

II. Abroad.

Prussian-Unionist Church. The "Neue Evg. K.-Zt." writes: "An ecclesiastical historian could and should know that the overwhelming majority of the Union friends in Prussia perhorrescirt every cooperative with the Protestant Association." To this Dr. Guericke adds: "Rather, every expert in Prussia knows reliably that in, as well as outside Prussia, the Union friends (of course, not counted merely alleged theologians) consist to 9/10, if not to 99/100 or 999/1000, of Protestant Union-friendly nihilists, and only to 1/10, 1/100 or 1/1000 of Oberkirchenräthlkch doctrinaire Unionists."

The General Lutheran Conference, which was held in Hanover on July 2 of last year, declared, among other things, that "for the true unity of the church, it is sufficient, but also indispensable, that there be agreement in the right doctrine and administration of the sacraments, which we find set forth in the confessions of the Lutheran church. Nevertheless, men like Kahnis and v. Hofmann, whose fundamental deviation from the confession is notorious, had a seat and a voice in this conference. The "Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" already reproached the Hanoverian Conference for this. Dr. Guericke writes in the latest issue of his journal page 276: "It is true in the main, What the N. Ev. K.-Z. 1868 page 534 says: 'Jn Hanover come a large number

exclusively Lutheran theologians together. If one surveys the notable writers among them, then one dissociates himself from the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, another denies the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ, the third the Lutheran doctrine of reconciliation, again others present non-Lutheran theories about, etc.'". Apparently in view of this fact, the "Pilgrim from Saxony" of March 28 of this year reports on this conference: "The participants became inwardly aware that we have a common confession, and that what we have in common in this confession is the main thing. It is unavoidable that theological science leads to individual differences in secondary matters" (does this also include the doctrine of Christ's person, of the Holy Trinity, of Holy Communion, etc.?), "but these disappear before the common possession; if the heart has its vital roots in the confession" (yes, if it has these!), then it is also possible if it has its roots in the confession. but is it possible even then, if one deviates from it in the foundation?), "then the speculative mind can here and there go its own ways, without having a separating effect (as we see this also in the Reformers)** (really?), "and even if it should go astray, it is held fast by the root, so that it cannot tear itself away from the maternal soil of the church** (for the tares like to remain on their maternal soil, especially where it is a question of office and bread or of the goal of turning the wheat soil of pure doctrine into the hemlock field of their heresy), "and does not lose the common center.** We must confess that if, in the German Churches not yet devoured by the Prussian Union, one thinks as the editor of the "Pilgrim" does, it will cost the Prussian shark no great effort to eat those Churches soon after all. What does it matter if a community which meets with Zwinglians, yes, Arians, as with brethren, also loses the Lutheran name and is called unirt, which it is? We recall here what Calov writes in Hülsemann's words: "It is as unseemly as it is unhelpful that in a council of orthodox and heterodox the same concurrent courts should be set up, when these are the latter according to the judgment of the former.... To deny the heterodox ecclesiastical communion (of which the common judgment in a competent Conti! is a species), it is sufficient if the orthodox, by the application of the right means of interpreting the Word of God, and by the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit, are certain that the heterodox do not agree with God's Word, let them after all desire to be tolerated in the external communion of the Church.** (**Syst. locc. th.** VIII, 401.) W.

Prussia. Probably one consequence of the greater freedom that has been granted to the Jews in recent years with regard to jobs that require a scientific education is the tremendous, and in addition constantly growing, rush of Jews to the higher educational institutions. For while the Jews in the old Prussian provinces constitute only 1? Proc. of the population, their number of pupils in the higher educational institutions amounts to 7,[29] Proc. Among Catholics there is one pupil of higher educational institutions for every 462 heads of the population, among Protestants one for every 243, among Jews already one for every 53 heads. Involuntarily, the question arises: how large will the number of those thus educated be after 25 years, if this ratio continues in this manner? - At least, to mention only one point, so great that all offices can be filled with Jews. (General Ev. Lutheran Church Medical Gazette)

Oesterecich. On the occasion of a case in which a Catholic priest sentenced to imprisonment invoked the provision of Art. XIV of the Concordat, according to which clergymen may serve their term of imprisonment in monasteries and not in the penal institutions of the state, the Vienna Higher Regional Court, in one of its last sessions, made a principal decision. It decided that the provision in question is in conflict with the equality of all citizens before the law, as expressed in the Basic Laws of the State, and must therefore be considered null and void, without the need for a special executive decree for this nullification. Convicted clergymen must therefore serve their sentences in the same prisons as other convicts. - Thus, the priest Dr. v. Florencourt (son of the well known

Cvnvertiten), the contributor to the "Vaterland", who, by confirmation of the judgment of the first instance by the highest court, has been sentenced to four months' imprisonment, must serve this sentence not in a penitential monastery, but in a secular prison. (General Ev. Lutheran Church Law).

The Gberkircheneollegium of the Lutheran **Church in Prussia (the highest authority of the so-called separated Lutherans in Breslau) has submitted a petition.**Lutheran Church in Prussia (the highest authority of the so-called separated Lutherans in Breslau) has addressed a petition to the House of Representatives, in which it asks that the rights of a publicly admitted religious society (i.e. not merely sect law) be attached to the entirety of its congregations, that namely its congregations be recognized as parishes, its worship buildings as churches, its clergy as having equal rights to the state as compared to those belonging to the Lutheran regional church, and its schools as special confessional schools. It also requests support for its church system from state funds.

(Stader Sonntagsbl.)

Dr. Münkel. Oiste burned down almost completely on February 8 (excluding the church and school and some houses) and Münkel's house, belongings, books and writings were also burned. He is to resign from his office and move to Hannoper; "60 years old one does not start from scratch". Pastor Strecker zu Fritzow was 61 years old when almost the whole village, church, school, most of the parish buildings burned in 1840, also his books, etc. He rebuilt everything and worked for 12 more years in great blessing in parish and synod (Cammin). So fresh forward! (Mtsschr.)

Saxony. The ruling Count and Lord of Schönburg and Glauchau has converted to the Roman Catholic Church in Rome. This event has caused great attention and excitement, since the convert belonged to the most outstanding personalities also in the ecclesiastical field and as the owner of large estates possessed a significant influence even in ecclesiastical matters and always exercised it for the good of the Lutheran Church, to which he had faithfully adhered. As a result of this transfer, the church council of Glauchau unanimously passed the following resolution at its meeting held on March 21: "The church council expresses its painful regret over the resignation of Mr. Karl, Count and Lord of Schönburg, from the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Mindful of its obligation to represent the parish in all legal matters, the undersigned church council claims for the parish of Glauchau represented by it with Rothenbach, AlberSthal and Elzenberg as its fundamental right Evangelical-Lutheran patronage, resolutely rejects any and all influence on the parish on the part of the Roman Catholic owner of the Receßherrschaft, Mr. Karl, Count and Lord of Schönburg, whether indirectly through a church authority appointed or co-appointed by him, or directly through the filling of clerical and school positions in the parish." The church board appoints a commission from among its members to take the necessary steps to secure the confessional right of the parish against the possible claims of the Roman Catholic receiver. (Indiana Staatsz.) From the "Pilgrim" we see that the Count's wife also converted. The "Pilgrim" also remarks: "The Protestant (Lutheran) congregations of the dominions of Glauchau, Wechselburg and Penig are thereby put in the case to take steps through their church councils to protect themselves against the possible consequences of this regrettable step. Perhaps through this and such incidents the congregations are awakening to the consciousness that it is not the secular authorities, but that they themselves are the original holders of the keys or church power. The case seems already to have had this fruit, at least in Glauchau, where the church council immediately invokes the "fundamental right" of the congregations it represents.

W.

After the foregoing had already been set, we received the Leipzig "Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kzt." of April 9 and 16. In it it is further reported that the Count, who had a rationalist upbringing, was received into the Roman Church on March 19 in Rome by Cardinal Reisach, after he had obtained a certificate of dismissal from the Lutheran Church from his former pastor, Consistorialrath and Superintendent Dr. Otto

in Glauchau had requested. The latter, however, has sent the following letter to the convert instead of it r

To His Excellency the Count Karl, Count and Lord of Schönburg.
Your Serene Highness

have asked me to issue you a dismissal certificate from the Lutheran Church to which you have belonged up to now. Your Honor has thereby designated me as your pastor - for only from him is one entitled to demand a dismissal certificate.

First of all, Your Eminence would like to approve my most humble declaration that I am not in a position, in accordance with this law, to issue a dismissal voucher without prior verbal discussion with the convert - and I thank God that it is so, for it would be bloody sour, if not impossible, for me to issue a dismissal from the Lutheran Church to a Count and Lord of Schönburg in order to convert him to the Papacy.

Nevertheless, I know that the lack of a dismissal certificate will not prevent the Roman clergy from admitting Your Eminence into the Catholic Church. I therefore do not attribute to my refusal the effect of delaying for a moment the step you intend to take. Perhaps my poor word will reach Ew. Erl. only when the fatal step has already been taken.

Be that as it may, I will carry out my ministry with a bleeding heart, as long as there is still a faint hope that it might be of use to Ew. Accordingly, I ask Ew. Erl. before the face of the Triune God, whether you have really searched with all seriousness where every sincere evangelical Christian has to search alone, namely in God's holy Word (Acts 17, 11)? As a servant of Jesus Christ, I testify to you, not only from my own experience, but from the experience of millions of faithful evangelical Christians, that the Roman church, with its teachings and ceremonies, is in bright conflict with God's holy Word, and that Your Eminence, by the way of the research commanded by God, could never come to the result: Darkness is light, and lies are truth.

And wh-what would Your Eminence have been researching? Here, for instance? Your Eminence calls me a pastor, and yet you have never told me of any doubts about the truth of the Lutheran Church; you have never given me the opportunity to assist you in your internal struggles - and yet it is the duty of the Protestant Christian, too, to turn to the pastor with his doubts. I must assume that Your Eminence did not doubt here, did not investigate here. So there in Rome?

Your Eminence, please forgive me if I find it incomprehensible how, in the few weeks of your stay there, you can have arrived at a result through honest research in the Scriptures, for which years of strenuous prayer and struggle are a short, perhaps too short, period. Your editors are mistaken. Your decision is not the result of free research in the Scriptures, but the result of overwhelming sensual impressions which Rome and what is in Rome have made on Your Eminence.

Oh, if there were still time to warn Ew. Erl. With your conversion, Your Eminence condemns the 300-year history of the House of Schönburg; you condemn your fathers, who rested in God, as caretakers and patrons of a false faith, a false church.

The Schoenburg College has hitherto borne the patronage of the Lutheran church and school with high honors; it is impossible to say how many blessings have also been wrought for Saxony by attracting faithful and conscientious preachers to the Schoenburg lands. You had inherited the task from your Erl. You had inherited from your father the task of preserving the position of the House of Schönburg in the Protestant Church of Saxony, as an inalienable, sacred good - the most beautiful inheritance of your father. You have spurned and rejected the most beautiful inheritance of your father; furthermore, our Lutheran Church will not align itself with your father; it will deplore you as an apostate or take offense at your fatal step.

Your Honor will at last be unable to continue the patronage of a church".

which you think you have acknowledged to be false, and if the Roman Church wanted to allow Ew. Erl. to continue such office, you, as a German prince, would not want to promote what is contrary to truth and false. Thus, Ew. Erl. harms the interest and the position of the common house by the conversion and the necessary consequences connected with it.

There will surely come an hour - of this the Catholics as well as the Protestants are certain - when we will give an account before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ of all that we have done in life and limb. O would His Holiness, before you take that step, remember the judgment of eternity!

I have only one hot prayer for Your Eminence, that what you want to do or have already done may not become difficult for you with its terrible force in your last, in your hour of death.

With heartfelt intercession and deep sorrow

Glauchau, March 15, 1869. with proper submission

Dr Karl Wich. Otto.

That the transfer had already really taken place was not yet known, nor could it be assumed, since the Count had only asked for his release. Nevertheless, a great excitement took possession of the minds, both in the Schönburg lands and beyond, and above all the question came to the fore: How will the relationship to the converts shape itself in his capacity as patron of all Lutheran parishes and as collator of all schools in the dominions of Vorderglauchau, Wechselburg and Penig, as well as co-owner of the general consistory in Glauchau? The conviction became general that he could not and should not continue to exercise his rights as patron, even if the applicable church law allowed it, and already in its meeting of March 19, the church council of Glauchau therefore unanimously decided on the above declaration.

A similar resolution was passed on March 25 by the church council of Meerane and protested "in the name of the congregation of Meerane, Seiferitz, Crotenlaide, Götzenthal, Kauritz and Dittrich most solemnly against any further exercise of the Lutheran church patronage by the Roman Catholic owner of the Reßherrschaft, Count Karl von Schönburg, or by a church authority appointed or co-appointed by him". - In the meantime, the official confirmation of the conversion of Count Karl of Schönburg and his wife, which took place on March 19 in Rome, was received by the General Consistory in Glauchau, and at the same time the declaration that Count Karl of Schönburg "has henceforth renounced all participation in the exercise of the consistorial and episcopal rights of the high general house of Schönburg in favor of the Protestant high house members". At present it is still unclear whether the patronage rights are also to be understood under the "episcopal rights", which is possible because the patronage is really of a sovereign nature within the territorial lordships, i.e. an outflow from the ***jus episcopale.*** If, however, the exercise of the patronage were reserved, the congregations would not calm down, for the count, without wanting to, really has the merit of having sharpened the confessional conscience of the people to the point of passionate excitement. Accordingly, a definite declaration regarding the patronage right will probably not be able to stay away for much longer.

An answer to the papal invitation to the Protestants to appear at the Lonell has recently been received from the theologians, professors and other clergy of the city and university of Groningen in Holland. It is written in Latin and states the reasons why these theologians do not believe they can participate in the Council. In the introduction it says: "The reason that prevents us from coming to you is only one, but a very important one, namely, that we are Protestant theologians and therefore cannot follow your and the Roman Church's decisions, since they are very contrary to the divine Gospel, but must protest against them. (After this well-sounding entry, the following passage is all the worse). "This you may not take as if we did not recognize in you many and excellent truly Christian virtues, nor as if we did not revere in your church, of which you are the head, many truly Christian elements; joyfully do we note this, and

Therefore give your church an excellent place in the general (universal!) church of our Lord Jesus Christ. For in many things the old Christian Rome has done very well for the human race, and in many things the new Rome is also doing well. We know, to mention only one thing, many pious and learned men in your church, through whose writings we still nourish our piety and increase our science, e.g. Fenelon and Sailer, who still speak as dead men. In our fatherland, too, there are now many men devoted to your church, with whom we are gladly, peacefully, even on friendly terms. Nor do you want to take the judgment about your church as if we believed that our church is pure from blemishes and errors and that people of whom the holy apostle (Titus 2:2) speaks is a people of which we are not the only ones. (Tit. 2, 14.) writes: redeemed from all unrighteousness, pleasing to God, striving after good works. We also see many faults in our church and in ourselves. But so may you receive our opinion, that we consider our church, though ***impure*** (***impura***), far less impure than yours, and believe that, whatever blemishes may attach to it, yet it proceeds from better principles than those on which your church, which boasts itself the catholic, is founded." - As such greater blemishes are then mentioned: The withholding of the Bible, the institution of the hierarchy, the inquisition and compulsion of the mind, the celibacy of priests uno indulgences, the worship of saints, and so forth. Then it goes on to say, "Not you, but JEsum Christum we recognize as the divine shepherd of the whole Church, you we hear only when you preach the Gospel." Finally, the Pope is invited to come to them, i.e., to the Gospel IEsu. He is already an old man; if he now leads his Church back to the Gospel, as much as is dear to him, he will be able to give an account of his well-conducted ministry to the supreme judge who is already awaiting him. -

One can see that the answer is a strange mixture of light and darkness. If the Groningen theologians on their side and on the Papal side admit as much as they do; if they have the Scriptures in their hands and are not pure of errors, it is difficult to see why they do not want to try a Roman ***Council*** and give the new Rome a new opportunity to make itself well deserved. Only inconsistency at present still prevents such "Protestants" from returning home to Rome. By the way, strangely contrasting with the above answer of Gröninger is the rally of an Episcopal preacher in Philadelphia. This man does not disgrace himself to write the following in the paper "***Catholic Union***": "The Pope deserves an answer from every Protestant preacher in the world; so let one cry out about my step, I care nothing for it, I only make use of my personal right. - The invitation of the Pope to the Protestants is for me the greatest event of the nineteenth century. I do not acknowledge his primacy; but who can deny what he says about our divisions? The ecumenical *Concil* should be heeded by all our bishops. I have a lively expectation that the Concil will succeed. Rome knows nothing of backtracking. In particular, I hope that two things will be put into effect by the Council: that ordination will confer real authority and that celibacy will be introduced among our clergy. How are clerical vestments without the priestly character, and how can priestly dignity be united with marriage?" (!!) Poor blind man!

A piece of German church lamentation in Bremen. From the "Pilgrim from Saxony" we learn the following: "Bremen has called itself a hostel of the church since ancient times, because it has always shown great hospitality to those persecuted for their faith. It is in great danger of losing this old fame, and perhaps of exchanging a new name for it; for, if things continue thus there, it will soon, as an ecclesiastical paper justly says, be rather to be called a cesspool of the Church. From time immemorial Bremen has been distinguished by its lively religious spirit, there is much faithful life there, and the clergy is still composed for the most part of excellent, resolute (?!) preachers of the Gospel. (This statement of the "Pilgrim" is probably based on an error. The greater part of the Bremen (city) preachers consists of Calvinists. In one (simultaneous) church, the union is carried out in the most blatant manner, in that a

Lutheran and a Reformed pastor jointly distribute the Lord's Supper. At the Lutheran cathedral church, finally, there have been for a long time more rationalist preachers than so-called believers). In addition, in recent times it has also had some zealous and gifted preachers of rationalist unbelief. In the same way, the Protestant Association has now turned its main attention to Bremen; the city seems to it to be the center of its anti-church efforts in the north. This year, therefore, it has moved its general meeting to Bremen, where it will discuss the relationship of the church to the state and the validity of the Holy Scriptures in the church and in science. The meeting was held at the same place where the relationship of the Church to the State and the validity of the Holy Scriptures in the Church and in science were discussed at length and in great depth, but nothing profound. Prof. Bluntschli gave a lecture on the former subject, in which he advocated the democratization of the church through presbyterial order and voting rights on the broadest possible basis, and Prof. Hanne took it upon himself to treat the latter subject, and treated it in such a way that the most negative minds could well be satisfied with it; apart from a few pompous (and hypocritical) expressions of appreciation and high esteem for this splendid book, not much more validity remained for it than for any other good scientific book. It must allow itself to be mastered and undermined by advanced time, as much as the spirits of apostasy like it. It is not yet desired to expel it altogether from the Church, but it must not claim to be the norm of doctrine and life, unless the Empress (or, as Luther says, the Hürlein) Reason graciously permits it. But this meeting passed without much effect or excitement (i.e., the honest people of Bremen would have done well to chase Bluntschli, Hanne, and consorts out of the gates with rods). On the other hand, a clergyman of the Martini congregation, Pastor Schwalb, who had recently been called to Bremen and who had already distinguished himself in Switzerland by his zeal for modern unbelief, attacked the church doctrine of the person of our Savior so excessively in public lectures that the faithful could no longer remain silent. .. . A fierce pen and pamphlet war was the next consequence; five members of the church council of his congregation appealed to the Senate with the request to preserve the right of the Protestant confession and to put a stop to such outrages. The great majority of the clergy issued a very strong protest against Schwalb's infidel doctrine and acceded to the demand of the churchwardens; a wealthy Bremen merchant, Lahuse, offered a prize for the best refutation of Schwalb's errors. Of course, the faithful witnesses had to accept the crudest and most spiteful maltreatment by the unbelieving press, from the Protestant church newspaper down to the Kladderadatsch. Their approach to the Senate, as was to be expected, was of no avail; the Senate replied that it saw no reason to interfere in the matter, and rejected the preservation of the confession that had been suggested to it. It is therefore not surprising that the faithful inhabitants of the city addressed a petition to their authorities, in which they demanded the separation of the church from the state and the independence of the former by means of a presbyterial and synodal constitution. The supporters of the Protestant Association, however, opposed this with great vehemence, although Bluntschli, the celebratory speaker, had himself spoken out against it at the General Assembly. The reason for the rejection was given very naively by the majority of the Senate, which was itself a Protestant Association: it was not yet time for such a rejection. It wants to keep its power, which is ruining the Church, in its hands until it has succeeded, by virtue of its right of patronage (which gives it a much more unlimited power over the Church than occurs even in absolute monarchies), in filling most of the ecclesiastical posts with supporters of the Protestant Association. Now, in a synod, the faithful would still have the great preponderance; this must be prevented at all costs. When the church is sufficiently ruined, so that the unbelievers form the majority, then the church government will be played into their hands with joy. Until then, things will remain as they are, and, if God does not interfere, the calculation will be correct according to human reckoning.

. In **Norway** it is the law that civil servants must profess the (Lutheran) state religion. A proposed amendment to this law has been rejected.

(There.)

Berlin church visit. An unusual census took place in Berlin on the last pagan Sundays of January. The local Protestant clergy had their officials determine the head count of those attending church on these days, and the result was highly unfavorable to the ecclesiastical sense of the Berliners. Of all the parishioners, an average of only 2.03 percent came to church. The numbers in the individual parishes deviated quite significantly from one another. The strongest attendance, namely 14-1/2 percent, was enjoyed by the sermon in St. Matthäi's Church, which, however, immediately after it in St. Lucas's Church already sank to 5-1/10 percent, in the new church amounted to no more than about 4/5 percent, in the least attended, St. Petri's Church, however, was even reduced to less than 3/4 percent of the parishioners.

Antipapist Movements in Bohemia and Austria. While the Roman Catholic world of both hemispheres has otherwise quite willingly offered its homage to the "kind" **Pio nono** on his so-called Secundity on April 11 in countless addresses and Peter's pennies (from 24 German "dioceses" alone a huge address with 800,000 signatures arrived in Rome), the sending of such devotional and congratulatory meetings has also met with resistance in individual corners of the Roman universal Church. So, for example, in old Prague. The present Rector Magnificus of the University, Dr. Schulte, had requested a congratulatory address on the occasion of the Secundity of Pius IX. In the name of the University, and the Academic Senate had raised this motion to a resolution. On Easter Monday, more than 80 doctors of the juridical Doctoral College of the University of Prague gathered and solemnly protested against this decision. This college also protested against the intended sending of a delegate of the university to the "ecumenical council". Both protests were joined by the College of Doctors of the Faculty of Medicine. A lively debate ensued and led to individual true and open-hearted confessions. Among others, Dr. Cizek spoke out decisively against the Senate's decision, "for the very reason that all the misfortune that has ever been conjured up over the Bohemian nation has regularly emanated from the papacy alone. According to the Kreuzzeitung, by the way, these protests were rejected by the majority of the Senate, and its resolutions were nevertheless carried. In Vienna, on the other hand, the mayor, Dr. Jclder (a Catholic), strictly forbade the collection of signatures of the school children for a congratulatory address to the pope, which had already been eagerly started in the communal elementary schools there, by means of rescripts to all the senior teachers of the city. The ultramontane press is furious about this and thinks that this means plugging the mouths of minors from which God has prepared his praise. R.

From Russia. It is well known how, for some years, all the measures taken by the Russian government against the German provinces have been based on the guiding idea of finally bringing about the complete Russification of these provinces through the consequent suppression of the Protestant (Lutheran) Church. The book recently written by Dr. A. v. Harleß in Munich, "Historical Pictures from the Church of Lievland," serves as a testimony to this. In it, Mr. v. Harleß demonstrates on record how Russian fanaticism daily forces Protestants, under threat of imprisonment and punishment, to hand over their children born in mixed marriages to the police, so that they may be forcibly baptized by Greek clergymen. And all this is done on the basis of positive laws, in the name of law and order, without a word being said about it, and just as if it all went by itself. In vain do petition after petition go to the imperial government to put an end to this appalling state of affairs; in vain do the nobility, the clergy and the peasantry appeal to the highest state officials for the restoration of a right to which they are constitutionally entitled, in vain a Russian sent to investigate the facts asserts that the conditions among the converted Latvians and Esthans of Livonia are a disgrace to the Russian name and the Russian church. Recently the Lutheran elementary schools have also been removed from the influence of the clergy and placed directly under the Minister of Education, and, in order to strike at the heart of the matter, the transformation of the Dorpat College into a Russian-fications institution has also been undertaken. - In a similar way the Russian government is now taking action against the Catholic Church in Lithuania and Poland. The Ostsee-Zeitung reports from Warsaw: "The measures which the Russian government has recently taken with regard to the Greek-Unionist Church in the Kingdom of Poland evidently testify to the intention of alienating the intended church community as far as possible from the Roman Catholic Church, with which it has been united for about 200 years, and of preparing its gradual fusion with the Orthodox Church. The measures aimed at this goal include, first of all, the purification of the Greek-uncatholic cult from all Roman Catholic customs and the introduction of the original Oriental church customs, as they also exist in the Orthodox Russian state church; furthermore, the abolition of the ecclesiastical communion that existed until now between the be-

The same measures were applied to the Greek-Unionist Church in Lithuania in 1839, and the result was that after only three years the Greek-Unionist Archbishop of Lithuania, the Archbishop of Lithuania, had already been in the position of the Archbishop of the Holy See, and the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church had been in the position of the Archbishop of Lithuania, and the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church had been in the position of the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church. The same measures were applied in 1839 to the Greek-Union Church in Lithuania, and the result was that after only three years the Greek-Union Archbishop Sicrnasko in Vilnius, with more than two million members of the Greek-Union Church community entrusted to his leadership, converted to the Orthodox Russian State Church. Whether the new bishop of the Greek-Unionist diocese of Chelm, Kuziewsky, will be found ready at the appropriate moment to take over the role of iemasko, cannot yet be foreseen with certainty; but that the Russian government has designated him for this role is not subject to any doubt, according to the preparations made up to now." In Poland itself the national language is being driven from the pulpit in Catholic churches, and in recalcitrant congregations the churches are being closed. The efforts of the Russian Government gradually to withdraw the Roman Church from the influence of the Pope, and to effect its union with the State Church, are also given as the proximate cause of the flight of the old Bishop Sosnowsky from Lublin. Recently the Czar summoned a so-called "***Collegium catbolicum***" to Petersburg under the pretext of effecting a union of the Catholics with the pope. All the bishops attended this synod except that of Plok, who was deported as a punishment. Bishop Sosnowsky sent a representative, but he gave an enlightening report on the actual tendency of the synod and was immediately recalled. The government now wanted to have the bishop "seized," but he fled to Galizim under the pretext of an inspection trip, and at the same time published the reasons for his flight in the form of a solemn protest. In the meantime he was prosecuted by the Russian government and the members of the Lublin chapter were brought under strict investigation as accomplices of his flight. At the same time religious excitement in Poland rose to the highest pitch. Papism and Caesareopapism offer each other defiance. The government is of the opinion One must not allow it to come about that the Russian Empire is a conglomerate of different peoples, like Austria, -therefore One Language - One Faith. The Papist Consistory in St. Petersburg, on the other hand, forbids its subordinate parish clergy to use the Russian language in preaching, under penalty of excommunication. N.

Japan. On January 11, the (Japanese) Government issued the following statement in response to the representations made by the representatives of the foreign powers concerning the persecutions of Christians: I have had the honor to take cognizance of your letter, dated May 26. The error which crept into the recent decree in regard to the Japanese Christians by placing the expressions "Christian religion" and "shameful sect" next to each other without connection, so that the Christian religion was called a shameful sect, has, as you are well aware, been improved later by separating the two expressions. The religion which 300 years ago called itself the Christian religion (namely, Catholicism, which was carried to Japan by the Jesuits) was most severely forbidden because it practiced the arts of sorcery, affected the minds of men, and caused unhappiness and rebellion; hence it came about that the people regarded it as a shameful religion. (Djashu.) Even now the government must maintain that strict prohibition, because the people do not yet understand the truth of the Christian religion. If now, while the people still live in ignorance, they should suddenly show themselves tolerant, it would be difficult to govern the people according to circumstances. If it should seem necessary to the government to have the truth of religion recognized in public meetings, it has not yet been possible because of the war. Consequently, no general legal provisions could be made, and it would be difficult to proceed according to the same principles in the various parts of our country. On the other hand, in view of the increasingly intimate relations between your country and ours, it was decided at a council meeting called by our government that strict measures against those of our subjects who adore the same dogmas as your people would imply a lack of consideration for you, and accordingly the strict procedure is to be abandoned and a mild one substituted in its place.

January 11, 1869. Signed: Hizushi Nuzi Chucho.

(Herald d, Gl.)

Teaching and Defense.

Volume 15. July 1869. No. 7.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 33.

If the sick desire Holy Communion, the question whether it is to be administered to them is to be decided according to what has already been said in § 18.*).

Note 1.

For the communion of the sick, the preacher is to provide himself with the elements, to have the act of confession with absolution preceded at all times by the laying on of hands, to prepare the table neatly on which he performs the consecration ("*strata linteis mundis mensa, cui et cerei ardentes quandoque adduntur", Calvoer*.), then, according to circumstances, to read out the exhortation to the communicants contained in the liturgy, to consecrate, and after the distribution to read a relevant antiphon and collecte, then to close with the blessing and the Lord's Prayer, and finally with a short exhortation or with a wish. Bidembach remarks: "It is right that, if the need and illness are great, that the same should not suffer such a long delay, the admonition should be omitted, but the prayer (after confession and absolution) and the words of Christ's foundation should never be omitted. If the sick person wishes to make his confession as he is accustomed to do, he is to be allowed to do so, or the usual form is to be recited to him. Before absolution takes place, the sick person is to be reminded in a few words whether he has no other secret concern in his heart, or any complaint in his conscience that weighs on him; if he feels that he has been afflicted, he should clear his heart and report the matter to the appointed ecclesiastic (in general or in particular), so that he may further report the matter.

*) The justification of home communion in cases of sickness, which Beza and other reformers reject, see in J. Gerhard *loc. de S. Coena, § 259. s*.

could be put to death. He is to be reminded not to harbor enmity, envy, or hatred in his heart, but to put them aside in accordance with Christ's admonition in Matt. 5:23, and to be of the same mind toward his neighbor as he desires forgiveness. If the sick person explains himself correctly, absolution follows. - Before leaving, the sacristan should give the sick person a brief reminder of the strange and glorious comfort that the sick person may derive from this food and especially from the presence of the true body and blood of Christ, that he may first of all be assured of the forgiveness of his sins, since he received the body and blood in the Lord's Supper, which Christ sacrificed and offered up for him. Item, that he may have with him the right viaticum and sustenance on the journey to eternal life, if God so desires to take him this time. And because his Lord Christ is with him, he has nothing to fear, but to say with the 23rd Psalm, "Whether I have walked, etc."" (Manual p. 655. ff.)

Note 2.

When performing home communion, the preacher should at least put around the beaters and use his own communion utensils for this purpose.

§ 34.

A preacher has the duty to visit also those members of his congregation who, though not physically ill, are otherwise afflicted with grave misfortune, or are in special peril and distress of soul, in danger of apostasy to a false religion, in grave trials of their own heart, (with doubts about divine truth, with despair, with blasphemous and suicidal thoughts), are involved in dangerous lawsuits, have come under urgent suspicion of a serious crime or have already been thrown into prison for it, have fallen into melancholy, frenzy, etc., or have been physically attacked by Satan. They have fallen into melancholy, frenzy, etc., are physically possessed by Satan, and so on.

Note 1.

The preacher will find excellent instructions and ample material for this in Olearius' Seelencur (pp. 235-802.), in Nie" Haas' faithful Seelenhirtten, as well as in Lassenius' afflicted and comforted Ephraim, an excerpt of which is given in the book: "Zwei und achttzig kurze Trostreden an Angefochtene aller Art. St. Louis, Mo. published by L. Volkening. 1861." 392 pages in 8. Especially important is what the former says of what is to be held against those who are afflicted with blasphemous thoughts, with the sorrow of having committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, and who are afflicted with suicidal thoughts.

Note 2.

Concerning in particular those who are physically possessed by the devil

the preacher must know that bodily possession can be imposed by God even on pious children of God. I.W. Baier writes:. "One of Satan's effects is bodily possession, by virtue of which Satan, according to his nature, dwells in the bodies of men, not only godless, but sometimes also pious, and works in them by divine permission. God, then, either directly or indirectly (i.e., through men, either through good ones, e.g., ecclesiastics, when they exclude gross sinners by the great ban, 1 Cor. 5:5, 1 Tim. 1:20, or through evil ones who seek to harm others, e.g., by means of enchantments or curses), permits men to be subjected to Satan. But although the purpose of this possession on the part of Satan is harm and destruction, partly of the possessed themselves, partly of other men, yet on the part of God, who permits it, and thereby either more grievous sins (contempt of the word, carnal security, blasphemies, conspiracy with the devil, etc.) with his serious judgment, it is not to be expected that he will allow it.) with his severe judgment, or punishes and tests the pious by bodily chastisement, the purpose being revelation of his power, justice, and goodness, and of men, if not the possessed themselves, at least others, namely, eye and ear witnesses, repentance, faith, and blessedness." (Compend. th. posit. P. I. c. 51.)

Quenstedt writes: "The actual characteristics of bodily obsession are: 1. knowledge of foreign languages, as well as of such arts and sciences, which the possessed have never learned before, and which, when freed, they can no longer learn. (2) Knowledge and knowledge of hidden things, and of things that have happened elsewhere in very remote regions, as well as of things to come. 3. more than human or supernatural power and strength. 4. the exact representation of the voices of birds, sheep, bulls, etc., without the necessary disposition of the organs. To this must be added 5. insolence of speech, 6. monstrousness of gestures, 7. horrible cries (Mark 5:5), 8. blasphemy of God and mockery of one's neighbor, 9. raging and raving against one's own body as well as against the bystanders, Matt. 8:28, 1:7, 15, Mark 5:5, Acts 19:19. 5, 5. Acts 19, 16. From these and similar signs, which, however, do not all occur at the same time in every single possessed person, but sometimes more, sometimes less, the bodily possession can be recognized. A special caution, however, is required, lest those afflicted with more serious diseases should be mistaken for possessed persons." (Theolog, didactico- polem. P. I. c. 11. s. 1. fol. 652.)

Concerning the proper treatment of the physically possessed, Luther writes: "We should not now, nor can we, cast out devils with certain ceremonies and words, as the prophets, Christ, and the apostles did in former times. Christ and the apostles have done. We should pray in the name of Jesus Christ, and earnestly exhort the church to pray that the dear God and Father

of our dear Lord Jesus Christ to deliver the possessed man by his mercy. If only such a prayer is made in faith on Christ's promise John 16:23, then it is strong and powerful, so that the devil must leave the person; as I could tell you several examples. Otherwise we cannot cast out evil spirits, neither are we able to do it. The poor people possessed by the devil under the papacy have not been rid of their evil, troublesome spirit by the art, words, and deeds which the conjurors have used. It cannot be cast out with bad words, such as these: Get thee out, thou unclean spirit! The conjurors did not mean it seriously. The power of God must do it, and one must stake his life on it, so that the devil will make him afraid enough. It cannot be done without fear. . The devil is either cast out by the prayer of the whole church, so that all Christians put together and bind together a prayer so strong and powerful that it penetrates through the clouds and is heard; or else he who casts out the wicked enemy must be highly enlightened in spirit and have a strong, steady courage, so sure of things as Elijah, Elisha, Peter, Paul, etc. The devil is cast out by the prayer of the whole church, so that all Christians put together and bind together a prayer so strong and powerful that it penetrates through the clouds and is heard. But that the devil went out by the invocation of papist monks and priests, and left a sign behind him, such as glass panes or a window, or tore a piece from the wall: this he did to ape the people, who did not know otherwise, that he had gone out, because he did not torment the possessed, all in the opinion that he would later, by such mirror-fighting, but in a different way, namely spiritually, possess the people and strengthen them in their superstition. So it happened in the church of St. Ciliax in the monastery at Weimelburg, not far from Eisleben, to which there was a great pilgrimage and attendance, that a monk, a good drinking brother, commanded a possessed man that he should open his mouth, let him put in two fingers, and yet not bite him. He also commanded the devil that he should go out when St. Ciliax's little bell was rung; this the mischievous man also did, that he might strengthen the poor people in the delusion and error that the little bell was so sacred that the devil must go out at its sound, and thus utterly destroy faith in Christ." (XXII, 1104. ff.) Compare also Luther's letter to the pastor Schulze in Belgern of 1545, in which is found the form of a prayer which the pastor, in addition to the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, should repeatedly say over a possessed person with the laying on of hands. (XXI, 1343. ff.)

As sad as it is when often even pastors think that bodily medicines are the only remedies for the "possessed", because they consider them only for melancholics, it cannot be denied that it is often very important to use bodily medicines against possession besides prayer and word. Dannhauer writes about this: "Since this enemy can only work through bodily instruments and ape men, therefore he begins with

increasing and the humidities in the people increasing moon (which can not be denied) its changes in the same. .. In the primitive Church a miraculous exorcism was once used, which was a divine charism, like the gift of speaking many languages. But as this is not given in an extraordinary way nowadays, neither is such an exorcism. But of the proper remedies there are three: 1. medicine; for as that enemy cannot work without instruments, for he works chiefly through the fluids of the human body, so these instruments must first be taken from him, which is to be left to a physician, and about which Brentius is to be found in Acts 19. 2nd Prayer, which must be done with the condition, if it be so pleasing to God. Therefore no man may presume that he will certainly accomplish the casting out of the devil. (3) Exorcism itself is also to be used, which, however, has its power. But here a heroic faith is necessary, which has not yet entirely disappeared. What the exorcists in the papacy are, is known, namely, sorcerers, and their exorcisms such sorceries in which they play in cahoots with Satan. The devil only pretends to flee, in order to gain thousands of souls; he gives a farthing for a farthing." (Theolog, casual. p. 304. 307-309.)

Balduin declares, among other things, that Holy Communion may be administered caeteris paribus even to a possessed person in free hours. (Tractat, de cas. consc. p. 630. s.) Fecht also calls attention to the fact that the possessed man, if he is a believer, is to be reproached in light hours, that the blasphemous speeches and the like which Satan foams out through him in paroxism are not imputed to him. (Instruct, pastoral, p. 93.)

The most thorough instruction as to how possession is to be recognized, how the phenomena thereby are to be judged, and how the possessed is to be treated, is found in Balduin l. a. O. pp. 615-648. and in L. Hartmann's Pastorale ev. pp. 1078-1093. A most curious example of diabolical possession and of the procedure observed in this case is found in: "Christian Scriver, Das Verlorne und wiedergefundene Schäflein (a certain Peter Otte), 1672," of which "Gotthold's Siech- und Siegesbett. Dresden 1835" contains a good extract (Thl. 2. pp. 126-137.). Compare also: "Nicol. Blumii historical description of a possessed student at Pirna. Leipzig, 1605." 4th, reprinted in Löscher's Unschuldige Nachrichten, volume 1716. A more splendid example of a faith-loving fighter against Satan could hardly be found than that of this Nie. Blumius, a Saxon Lutheran pastor, who had been charged with the treatment of the possessed student of Polycarpus Leyser.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

Pastor Diedrich and the "Antichrist".

Mr. Rev. Diedrichs writes in the "Lutherische Dorf-Kirchenzeitung" of August 1868 literally as follows: "The Missourians have -recently said*): Whoever does not recognize the Pabst as the Antichrist, they did not want to think of him as a Lutheran, indeed as a Christian, and Münkel has publicly denied them any fellowship over this. Our dear brother Brunn nevertheless (!) took the Missourians to task, saying that our symbols undoubtedly denoted the Pabst as the Antichrist, and that every Lutheran must submit to the symbols in a simple-minded way. At the outset I must declare that such a way of proving is not pleasing to me in the sight of God, for the symbols, etc." I will not dwell on the fact that Past. D. puts into the mouths of the "Missourians" what they have never so said, but only to remark that the Missourians reject the proposition, "He that knoweth not the Pope to be the Antichrist, we hold him not to be a Christian," as decidedly as Past. D. himself rejects it. That is what Past. D. know it, too. And if Mr. Past. D. is thoroughly dissatisfied with the fact that and how Mr. Past. Brunn takes the Missourians to his defence, and makes the symbols say that the Pabst is the Antichrist, we cannot help that. Past. Brunn has defended the truth, and Past. D. could have left out his "in the sight of God," In view of the second commandment! - But if Past. D., after proving (probably from fear of symbol idolatry in Prussia!), or yet pointing out, that the symbolical books are a human work, and as such have their imperfections, adds the "theological" declaration: "I assure God that I do not say this because I consciously disagreed with some things in the symbols and only wanted to leave a loophole open, but I agree with them wholeheartedly," so one must, even without the boyish postscript: "and whoever does not want to believe me, let it remain," regard the explanation only as an honestly meant one, but one that has come out of self-deception. Or would it not be self-deception if Past. D. says: "If they" (the Missourians) "think that the symbols pronounce it as a statement of faith: that the Pope is the Antichrist, this is not even true," and immediately adds: "In the Schmalkaldic Articles Luther calls the Pope the Antichrist with great zeal"?! Are not the Schmalkaldic Articles among the symbols? Or did Luther not speak "confessingly" in them? Just read the fourth article of the second

*) In contradiction to our old teachers (see Quenst. p. 1668. A. D.) See: "Die Evang.-Lutherische Kirche u. s. w." by Prof. C. F. W. Walther, x. 121. - How easy it is now in Germany to refer to the "old teachers."

A. d. E.

When one has read the sentence: "This piece shows tremendously that he is the right end-Christ or antichrist" (papam esse ipsum verum antichristum), - one must no longer really trust "his" own senses, if one wants to say with Past. D. to say, "So I am not justified in saying, that the Reformers set up the creed, "the pope is the antichrist." But Past. D. maintains that one is not entitled to such an assertion. "For," says Past. D., "in creeds one does not express oneself in such a way that something should be called once the whole and then only a part." But, we ask, does this then happen in the Schmalkaldic Articles? No, but "in the symbols." And now comes the old story: "Melanchthon says in the Apology (Art. XV.: ""So also the Pabstry will be a part of the kingdom of Antichrist, if it so defends human worship as to justify it."" Past. D. does not quote verbatim, but his quotation should apply. Now where does it say in the "Symbols," that the Pabst is a piece of the antichristian kingdom? For that is what the Pabst would have to be called, if Past. D.'s argument should be correct. Even Past. D. must admit that Luther, in the Schmalkaldic Articles, speaks of an Antichrist (the Pabst), in whom the characteristics drawn in the Holy Scriptures are combined without exception. Melanchthon, on the other hand, includes in the realm of the same all who are of his, the Antichrist's, kind and are driven by his spirit. Now how can one draw the conclusion from this: Ergo, do not set up the symbols as an article of faith: The pope is the Antichrist?!

"So better keep your mouth shut!" tells Past. D. to Missourians. Strange, when we Missourians, at the Lord's command, let the Lord fill our mouths, Lutheran theologians tell us, "You need not fill your mouths so full." - Or do we teach, confess, defend anything other than what God has revealed to us in His Word? If, according to Luther's counsel, we "open our mouths," and speak as Luther spoke, and as Melanchthon spoke (NB. Melanchthon says of the pope, "This definition, which does not rhyme at all with the true churches, but does rhyme well with the Roman pope's nature, is found not only in the Canonists' books, but Daniel the prophet paints **the** Antichrist in this way Ap. C. Art. VIL et VIII.), - so we are told: Do not take your mouth so full, you Missourians; Luther and Melanchthon do not talk like you!

Past. D. will of course object: I do not say that; I merely say that if Luther and Melanchthon also speak as you do (for "Melanchthon also in his other writings calls the pope the antichrist"), they do not understand by it what you understand by it. And the proof of this? Past. D. says, "Luther also allowed Melanchthon to call the pope in his signature in the Schmalkaldic Articles the supreme bishop.

if he only wanted to claim such an office according to human rights" - i.e., if the pope wanted to cease to be pope - or not? - and Luther calls the pope together with the Turks and other false teachers Antichrists. So I am not justified in saying: the Reformers establish the dogma: The Pope is the Antichrist." That's a conclusion like that: I am not justified in saying: Judas is called the betrayer by Luther; for all false Christians who have similar dispositions to Judas are together called betrayers by Luther - *ergo* Luther does not establish the creed: Judas is the betrayer. - Past. D. himself confesses: "I for my part, as I have already said, have for long years held all apparent Christianity, which in obsession with its own glory and excellence (whether in intelligence or in practice) covets devout and childlike simple-minded homage from souls, to be antichristianity, and moreover Pabstthum as the matador among all others." Well then, if the papacy is the matador among all other antichrists, then surely the pope is also the antichrist? Far from it, you Missourians! For once these have only been the "historical reflections" of Past. D.'s "were," which he thought right, "but imposed on no other at the risk of his blessedness. It is thus considered, and it is the sorrow of so many theologians, including Past. D.'s, that we Missourians do not also "so consider it," but always immediately measure such considerations with God's Word, and then also with the "symbols," and (since they are to "teach") either reject or "impose" the same according to findings. What would become of this if one were to take all "ecclesiastical questions" so seriously in the present day? "Indeed, it would be a farther and more profound upheaval than a revolution, or than the change of the democratic form of government into the monarchical, or than the abolition of slavery in a country would entail," says also a "Pabstritter" with reference to another "ecclesiastical question." *) - And then, although also Past. D. says: "If one wanted to see the Antichrist in the Republicans or the like, I would well judge that he understands nothing of Christ" - one must only "consider" that Past. D. "judges," just as he contemplates. Neither his contemplation nor his judgment is forced upon anyone: And this I find very commendable. For that he should not be a Christian (according to Past. D.'s judgment: "he understands nothing of Christ!") who sees "the Antichrist" in the republicans, this "judgment" is indeed very beautifully, but nevertheless somewhat unclearly motivated: "Since the right Antichrist will always come in as conservatively and well booted (organized) as possible, leaning on the monarchical, because he himself is something monarchical. Republics are flowers and shrubs, but monarchies are trees, and yet the Antichrist wants to grow into heaven. Antichristianity is

*) See Prof. G. Fritschel's "Wucherthesen."

the Cultus Department of the Prince of this world - with itio in paters." - So once again, how nice, how comforting it is that Mr. Past.D. is not bitterly serious about his "reflections" and "judgments." It must be a gentle resting-pillow for himself. For "since the political upheavals, I will finally confess, I have become somewhat more doubtful (sic!) about my earlier" (communicated above) "view; not as if Luther's and my earlier views were wrong" (that is well and beautifully said!), "but whether this previous pope in this guise must always remain the matador."

Past. D. frightens the people with such sentences; he feels it himself and therefore calms the minds immediately and says: "I am quite content that he remains as before, because the earth must nevertheless keep a hole for its inner fire. The pope, then, the hole of the earth for its inner fire! Many an "observation" can be made in this connection. But Past. D. goes further. "I see," he says, "that to-day others are still wiser than he" (the Pabst), "I only recall X. III. and of Hengstenberg, each in his own way." So, either Napoleon or Hengstenberg. If that is decided, then the Antichrist is there. "A man Pabst and Emperor at the same time, who in the name of God would sanctify as religion what the Emperor wants, and what the Chambers had to decide beforehand: how great would then become the bondage of the world! Could a Christian then still breathe?" One sees the "Reflections" in the study-room exalted above the wretchedness of the earth. There one forgets that the pope has not only asserted that his power is "compared with that of the worldly rulers, like the sun, the great light of day, as against the moon, the little light of night; - but that he has really brought it so far that great empires have paid tribute to him, the mightiest of the earth have held his stirrup, and the German emperors have bowed before him. One forgets that the pope commands angels and devils, that he not only commands in the "name of God," but also pretends that he is God or Christ's governor on earth; one forgets the distress of the children of God (which really already existed before the Antichrist to be expected: "Napoleon III. or Hengstenberg"), out of which they fearfully and yet in faithful confidence cry out, "Keep us, O Lord, by thy word, and forbid the murder of the Pabst and the Turk," and forget that it is not the Pabst's fault that "a Christian can still breathe.

But one does not forget alone in such "reflections," one thinks also. And if one thinks of Napoleon III. or even Hengstenberg as emperor and pope at the same time, well, one may run out of breath even before these pope-emperors have seized us by the throat.

How does Past. D. in his "Reflections on Pabstism" with the symbols! For many years he has considered all apparent Christianity, etc., to be antichristianity, and moreover, "the

Pabstism as the matador among all others, and the latter because "there, without actually being religion (God or worship, 2 Thess. 2.), it is nevertheless practiced with many ceremonies, in which everyone can think of many good and less good things" (O woe! reflections again!). "The ceremonies sometimes remind one of Christ, one tolerates all sorts of things, one entertains the masses, flatters the corporate spirit, which results in love for the ""church,"" one does many ""good works"-and the church is great, a spiritual-bodily earthly kingdom above all the world."" So, that is what is to be said against the Pabstry? nothing else?! And the "pseudo-Christianity" in the papacy is not really "religion?" What then? Melanchthon says, "And what may the public cause of many words? When the adversaries defend these services" (namely, the above ceremonies of Past. D.) "as his works, by which one earns forgiveness of sin and blessedness, they set up public antichristic doctrine and kingdom. For the kingdom of Antichrist is actually such a new worship. ----------

So the papacy also becomes a part of the kingdom of Antichrist, if it teaches how to obtain forgiveness of sin and reconcile God through the commandment of men. ----------

And we cannot be sufficiently surprised that the adversaries, against all the Scriptures of the apostles, against the Old and New Testaments, may----------

teach that we are to obtain eternal salvation and forgiveness of sins through such worship. For what is this but as Daniel saith, To honour God with gold, and silver, and precious stones, that is, to hold that God will be gracious unto us by divers church ornaments, flags, candles, as then be innumerable in such statutes of men." (Apol. C. Art. XV.)

But we really must not take it too closely with the individual "considerations" in Past. D.'s article. Let us not forget that it is written against the Missourians. There is no need to ponder every word in the fear of God. The Missourians are, after all, people who declare the Pope to be the Antichrist, and thereby claim to base this declaration on God's word and symbols; these Missourians do not allow themselves to be dissuaded from their declarations by "the amiable appearance" of the present holder of the papal chair, nor by the "threatening figures" of Napoleon III. and Hengstenberg, and to be forced into all kinds of edifying (?) reflections and thoughts. What wonder, therefore, if these "bushmen" are treated somewhat harshly. That is why also Past. D.: "It is strange that the Missourians at the same time argue that the Antichrist can be blessed, at which Past. von Rohr is appalled." The displeasure of Past. D.'s the horror of Past. von Rohr, should surely be reason enough for the Missourians to dismiss what displeases and horrifies them. But no, they even argue for it; that is, that the pope may be blessed!

may it be permissible to ask with whom the Missourians have argued about this? Who among our pabstical opponents has ever asserted that all popes must be damned? But if we say (to the praise of divine grace!) that one, although he has been condemned to be a pope, will be blessed if in his last hour he keeps faith with the Lord Jesus, - does Past. D. strange too? Let us hear: "It certainly sounds strange that the man of sin, the child of perdition (according to 2 Thess. 2.), should as such also become blessed, or, as the Missourians themselves say, "'the chosen armour of the devil.'"

So says, literally and literally, the "village church paper." Such wretched levity may be shown to Missourians with impunity. But it is a lie to say that we teach that the pope as such, as the man of sin, etc., shall be blessed. And the whole nonsensical proposition, as given above, is not improved by the fact that it is the occasion of a fall-out against Huschke, and of the final judgment of Past. D.'s final judgment on the Missourians, in which he says: "No, now I think at least no better of them (the Missourians), for they have declared honest souls, who think of hell and damnation (according to Thess. 2.) when they hear "'Antichrist,'" and cannot so mirror-fence, to be un-Christians by their mirror-fencing."

Is it true that the Missourians declare him to be an unchristian who, according to 2 Thess. 2, thinks of hell and damnation when he thinks of the Antichrist? No, they are not so stupid, nor so thoughtless, as to "judge" that he who thinks of republicans and the like when he thinks of "Antichrist" understands nothing of Christ; but they allow themselves, for the sake of "sound theology" and "sober reason," to express their strong doubts to the theologian who, according to 2 Thess. 2, ---------- t hinks of Napoleon III. or Hengstenberg when he ---------- t hinks of "Antichrist.

May this cause Mr. Past. D. to better "reflections." -

Lic. Dr. E. Preuß.

Until a few weeks ago, reports from Berlin about Licenciat Dr. Eduard Preuß, Docent at the University and Senior Teacher at the Royal Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium in Berlin, made the rounds in German and English political, as well as Roman Catholic newspapers, which certainly filled many of our readers, no less than ourselves, with deepest sorrow, yes, with horror. In it, the suspicion was expressed, and in part positively asserted, that the named man had been guilty of a serious crime and had escaped to America in order to avoid criminal prosecution. It seemed to us, however, already suspicious that the reports here were only of political, mostly Christian, crimes.

If we were to believe that the reports of Dr. Preuß were spread by organs hostile to Christianity and by papist organs, whose account could be traced back to articles in anti-Christian political newspapers in Germany, namely in the "Protestantische Kirchenzeitung" of Berlin, this fanatical enemy of all positive Christianity, as to their source, our Christian feeling was even more reluctant to believe the reports without further ado, since it was a man like Preuß about whom these horrible rumors were circulated.) Dr. Preuß is, after all, not only the meritorious editor of the Examen Concilii Tridentini by Martin Chemnitz, of the Compendium theologiae positivae by J. W. Baier, and of the Loci theologici by Johann Gerhard, but he has also prepared several theological writings himself, which are true gems in the theological literature of our time. We mention here only the two: "The Roman Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception Presented from the Sources and Refuted from God's Word. Berlin by G. Schlawietz. 1865," and: "The Justification of the Sinner before God. From the Heil. Scriptures. Ibidem. 1868." The first of these writings is acknowledged to be the best and most powerful that has been written on the subject of the same in older and more recent times, and bears as much testimony to the thorough scholarship as to the excellent exegetical ability of the author. It is irrefragable, for the opponents, with all the classical calmness of the polemic, devastating; therefore it can of course not be surprising if Roman Catholic papers devoured the reports of the unbelievers about such an opponent as Preuß with ravenous appetite and sought to spread them with triumphant joy. The second of the cited writings is without doubt the most excellent thing that has been written about justification in this century. It gives in a masterly manner the core of biblical Lutheran theology, and on every page it testifies to the experienced true Christian who has passed through the school of temptation.

In this state of affairs, as we know it, the thought must naturally arise in our minds: Should this dear man not perhaps be innocent and only the victim of an anti-Christ intrigue, a web of deceit spun over him for the purpose of getting rid of his mighty testimony for the eternal old truth and against all forms of the new error forever by a fatal blow? To get to the bottom of the matter, we were urged not only by the love of a brother for a dear brother, by gratitude to a witness of truth who, as we knew, had already been much maligned, by concern for the church and the honor of God, but we were also specifically prompted to do so by the fact that we were brought together personally with Dr. Preuß.

*) Later we were told that the local Reformirte Kirchenzeitung had also been so careless as to believe the reports about Dr. Preuß and to spread them in its columns.

In order to be as sure as possible, we officially addressed the Reverend General Superintendent Dr. Buechse in Berlin, the former highest ecclesiastical authority and the former confessor of Dr. Preuß, on January 20 of this year. Preuß, who not only lived on the spot and, by virtue of his official position, must have been able more than anyone else to provide irrefutable certainty about the source and meaning of the rumor, but who also had the reputation of a conscientious church official with Christian experience both over there and here.

Even before we had received the answer to our inquiry, however, No. 29 of the so-called "Kreuz-Zeitung" from Berlin of this year, which, as is well known, is the most widely read political paper in Prussia, especially by Christian-minded people, came to us without our seeking it, in which it is publicly testified that all that one could accuse Dr. Preuß consists solely in the fact that he had a few times a few years ago behaved in an indecently confidential manner towards his pupils, but that this had been used by his theological opponents to blast out all kinds of gruesome rumors about him, even to stamp him as a criminal, whereby a further successful public activity in the school and at the university had been made impossible for him (according to the old maxim of experience: "Calumniare audacter, semper aliquid haeret," i.e. "Slander only impudently. i. Slander only impudently, something always remains, even if the innocence of the slandered is proven), therefore he voluntarily resigned his offices and moved to America on the advice of friends, although reluctantly. It says in the above-mentioned "Kreuz-Zeitung" under February 3 of this year: "Lic. Dr. Preuß here took his resignation a few weeks ago as a high school teacher and as a docent at the university. This happened, as much as has become known with certainty, as a result of conflicts into which he had fallen through all kinds of dark rumors that had been spread about him. He then went to America, because - as we are informed from informed sources - he had been convinced that he could no longer hold his own in his home country in the face of so many adversaries. As a result, various papers opposing Dr. Preuß' direction in theological science have spread the most serious accusations against him, as if he had committed atrocious crimes; indeed, the authorities have been accused in the press of having deliberately allowed a criminal to escape abroad. The local 'Protestant Church Newspaper' - organ of the Protestant Association - also portrayed the matter in this way. This is untrue. To be sure, Dr. Preuß, who was, by the way, a very gifted teacher, had - as we only learned on this occasion - a few times in the past behaved in a reprehensible and thoroughly indecent manner in his intercourse with pupils; but of any act which

would have to be prosecuted, nothing came to the attention of the authorities despite inquiries made, so that after Dr. Preuß had taken the dismissal, the authorities had no reason whatsoever to prosecute the matter."

Since Hengstenberg, as whose opponent Dr. Preuß had appeared at least indirectly in his last paper on justification, had also been named as a witness against Dr. Preuß, the "Kreuz-Ztg. still remarks: "Professor Hengstenberg has declared that two things are certain, first, that there can be no question of coarse, dirty things, that nothing is present which falls under the paragraphs of the Penal Code. Then, that since 2½ years, when Dr. Preuß was made aware of evil rumors by Director Ranke and admonished to be cautious, he has always behaved with the greatest restraint in his intercourse with the youth." About the emigration of Dr. Preuß, the "Kreuz-Ztg." says: "The idea of going to America did not first arise in Dr. Preuß, but came to him from outside, and only reluctantly did he submit to it. It came from benevolent men who were led by the opinion that he had no future here, but that such a future would be easy to prepare for him in America, given his excellent gifts and knowledge. This much we have been able to learn about this sad affair by careful inquiries. We do not consider ourselves called upon to enter into a discussion of the news and judgments which have been spread by some newspapers, sometimes carelessly, sometimes maliciously."

Shortly thereafter, a submission appeared in the same newspaper with 22 signatures, which read as follows: "Declaration. With reference to the article in No. 29 of this newspaper, we feel compelled to publicly express the love and appreciation we owe to Lic. Dr. Preuß by signing our names. Some of us have been his students for a long time, some of us for a short time, some of us have been his students since the beginning of his teaching activity here in Berlin at the school or at the university or at both institutions and have been taught by him during all this time with a loyalty, sacrifice and prudence as by few others. We owe him a great deal from a scientific point of view and have always been guided by him to the path of the most scrupulous conscientiousness and integrity before God and man. Thus we miss him and his supportive teaching now daily with difficulty."

On March 9 of this year we finally received the answer to our inquiry addressed to the General Superintendent Dr. Büchsel in Berlin. We give the entire answer to our official inquiry in its wording on the condition that we do not proceed indiscreetly with it, since the letter, provided with the seal of the General Superintendent, has the character of a public official document. It reads as follows:

"Berlin, Feb. 10, 1869 - In consequence of your letter of Jan. 20, a. c., I inform you that the licentiate Dr. Preuß has voluntarily resigned his offices as senior teacher at the Gymnasio and at the University here. His opponents, who have hated him for a long time because of his decided theological and political direction, have brought accusations against him, which have caused him to leave the fatherland, as I think, in a hasty manner.*) All this happened so unexpectedly and so very quickly that I was only able to see and speak to Dr. Preuß once for a short time. He was accused of having indulged in confidences unbecoming a teacher in his dealings with his pupils about two years ago. By his enemies the dark rumors are extended to such an extent that one would like to stamp him a criminal. By his sudden departure he has opened the door to slander. For years he attended my church very diligently and took the sacrament unusually often. I have never heard of anything detrimental about his moral conduct. He lived in quiet seclusion with his good mother. His beautiful and rich knowledge and his excellent talent as a teacher were generally acknowledged. I recently had the opportunity to hear with what gratitude and love many of his students remember him. My personal conviction is that I believe I may ask you to take care of him and to open the way for him to use his gifts and powers in the service of the Church. †) If an opportunity should arise to do so, I ask you to send him my warmest greetings. Yours, etc.

Dr. Buechsel."

*We, too, believe that it was an act of haste when Dr. Preuß immediately gave way to the angry attacks of his opponents, resigned his offices and emigrated. The dear man, however, had evidently been so much disturbed by the storm that had unexpectedly broken over him that he was easily seduced by benevolent friends and followed a misguided conscience in order to spare the church, as he thought, an unnecessary fight over his person and because he did not think he could continue to work in blessing in a city like Berlin after he had become the object of such horrible accusations. He did not consider in the first moments of excitement that by his evasion he would give his enemies the desired opportunity to suspect him all the more. W.

†) This remark of the General Superintendent is all the more important, since in our inquiry, frightened by the appalling accusations we had read in the newspapers, we had expressed our decided misgivings as to whether Dr. Preuß, after having been so disgraced, could ever again be active in a church office.

W.

This the answer.

Concerned as we were that the authorities themselves might have raised accusations or doubts against Dr. Preuß in the requested and received dismissal document, we asked him to inspect it. He has now handed over not only this document in the original, but also his supplication for dismissal, as a result of which he received the same, and has left it to us for any use that appears to be beneficial. We therefore take the liberty of communicating both letters here as well, since Dr. Preuß now belongs to our dear America by God's miraculous providence.

The wording of the Supplik is as follows:

> "To the h. Kgl. Provinzialschulkollegium of the Province of Brandenburg. - To a high Royal Provincial School College I venture to address the following respectful request: The violent storm which has arisen against me in the public papers on the occasion of my last writing has at the same time become the signal for a number of accusations which have reached the Director privately. Under these circumstances, my remaining at the Kgl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium would do more harm than good to the institution. Therefore I ask a h. Therefore, I ask the Royal Provincial School Board to release me from my position as head teacher with the greatest of respect. E. high Royal Provincial School Board most obedient Preuß, Head Teacher at the Royal Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium. 105 Lützow Street. Berlin, December 14, 1868."

The answer was:

> "Berlin, December 8, 1868. 8. 9153. - By accepting Your Worshipfulness's declaration to resign from your office as head teacher at the Royal Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium here, which has been submitted to us by the Principal Dr. Ranke on the 15th of this month, we hereby dismiss you from your official duties with the remark that the resignation from office also results in the loss of pension entitlement. Royal Provincial School College. Reichenau."

We cannot conclude without expressing the hope, nay, the conviction, that what Joseph said to his brethren, who had sold him into Egypt, was here again proved true in the hostile world: "Ye thought to do evil unto me; but God thought to do well, that he should do as it is now in the day." Gen. 50:20.

Having already written the foregoing, we received from a man of European learned reputation in Berlin another, Mr.

Letter of March 13 concerning Dr. Preuß. Although we do not have the permission to mention the name of the writer, we do not believe we are proceeding indiscreetly if we herewith communicate at least the following from that letter:

"I do not have the honor of being known to you personally or by letter. However, perhaps you have heard of my name, and in any case, although completely unknown to you, I dare to address you in the matter of Dr. E. Preuß, who, I am told, is now staying with you.

"You know the way in which Dr. Preuß was driven from here and the rumors that followed him. I do not belong to the special acquaintances of Dr. Preuß, nor to the followers of his religious direction. I am completely impartial and have only the highest interest that justice be done. Up to now I have not participated in any statement either for or against Dr. Preuß. But to you, who are far removed from the circumstances here, I feel obliged to provide some clarification.

"As far as the teaching activity of Dr. Preuß is concerned, he was excellent, rich in knowledge of all kinds, eager and conscientious. He had an extraordinary interest in the advancement of his pupils. In this I confirm the general voice.

"As far as the accusation of an immoral way of life is concerned, and in particular his relationship with his pupils, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to three things.

"1) The investigation, if one may so call it, has been conducted with extraordinary passion. It emanated from Jews and opponents of devout Christianity, and has been carried on for years in the most spiteful manner, with the expressed intention of driving Dr. Preuß, who exercised a considerable influence, from his position, and thereby furthering the purposes of an ultra-liberal ecclesiastical tendency. If this intention had not prevailed, and if Dr. Preuß had not increased hatred against himself by his books on the immaculate conception and justification, no accusation would have been made against him, but would have been confined to secret suspicions.

"2) The public prosecutor has officially investigated the accusations communicated to him and has found no reason to intervene in any way. Dr. Preuß remained here long enough after the catastrophe to be brought to court if he was guilty in the slightest.

"3) The principal witness against Dr. Preuß is not very reliable in moral matters. He is said to have changed his statements considerably recently.

"Although I have remained fundamentally aloof from the whole affair, I have nevertheless reliably experienced the above. Among his immediate pupils, besides the opponents already mentioned, Dr. Preuß has always had many enthusiastic supporters who are still faithful to him. They belonged to the most reliable characters. His pupils were divided into two classes, of which the hostile one, supported by external circumstances, prevailed.

"This, my dear sir, I take the liberty of communicating to you. Use the contents of my declarations as you see fit. For their authentication I have called myself to you. I do not wish my name to be mentioned publicly."

In this year's April issue of the "Monatsschrift für die ev.-luth. Kirche Preußens, herausg. von C. Behrends" we find the following note: "The Protestant Church Newspaper admits that it happens to every party to see unworthy subjects attached to it, nevertheless it gives to understand that the people are not so wrong when they assume a relationship with orthodoxy and gross sins of the flesh. And the rumors of such, whether true or false, are collected with zeal. Lic. Preuß and Herr v. Zastro in Berlin, Father Hermani in Nassau are said to be outstanding orthodox and to have stained themselves with unnatural vices. Now these are lies in regard to Preuß; nevertheless lies, which have received a strong semblance of confirmation by the perverse counsel of his friends to emigrate to America." etc. W.

Free state and bound church.

Under this heading the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" contains an article from which we report the following:

"When in the autumn of 1853 the Protestant General Synod was held in Bavaria, public papers reported that the Royal Government Commissar, Baron von Rothenhan, at the opening of the Synod, had said, among other things, "that the nature of our Protestant Church requires us to be closely connected with the State and to recognize in the King, in whose name the episcopate of our holy Church is exercised, the patron of the same." . . Where then is this written in Scripture? What constitutes the nature of our Church is stated in our Confessions. Where is this written in the confessions? But those words do express a truth, namely the actual state of affairs. This, however, has neither resulted from Scripture nor developed properly out of the nature of the church, but from an embarrassment of the church in days of great

This was the result of great necessity and political decisions of the Imperial Diet, which at first only aimed at the external peace of the country (Augsburg Religious Peace of 1555 and Peace of Westphalia of 1648). By these, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishops in the territories of the Protestant states of the empire was declared suspended, and the arrangement of the church system there was left in the hands of the secular rulers. These now settled in with their own, as well as they could, or as well as they understood it, here one way and there another. But the congregations? Well, they mostly stood and watched how their gracious lords did it, and were happy if they noticed as little as possible.

Heroes usually find their singers afterwards, and legal turmoils their legal scholars, who try to plan the ruffle, make a virtue out of necessity, and a system out of what has happened. So also here. First, the episcopal system, which still preserves some old church reminiscences. According to it, the prince is the legal successor of the bishop by virtue of the imperial rights and has to exercise them according to the measure of the Augsburg Confession. Confession, or rather to have them exercised by other suitable persons. But in the subsequent territorial system these historical considerations have already been thrown off. There it is simply said: Cujus regio, illius et religio - he who is lord in the land is also lord in the church. This thoroughly anti-Christian and anti-church principle has at any rate the merit that it did not merely stand on paper. It was followed long before it was pronounced. And Germany has thus become a veritable pattern card of churches and little churches, none of which was organically connected with the others. Behind each boundary post, each one arranges himself as he can and likes. Philip of Hesse reformed the church system of his country, but in the midst of Hesse Fritzlar and Amöneburg remained Catholic, for they belonged to the Elector of Mainz. The Eichsfeld, situated between Brunswick, Hesse and Saxony, is reformed back into Catholicism, for it belongs to the Elector of Mainz. Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Kassel reformed his country from Lutheran to Reformed. What does he ask that the people beyond the next village to the north remain Lutheran; he is not their sovereign. What does it prevent him that even his cousins in Upper Hesse do not go with him? Cujus regio, illius et religio. The Palatinate is reformed by its electors in a short time between Lutheranism and Calvinism three times back and forth, only to endure a hundred years later the attempt of a reformation into Catholicism. Margrave Jacob of Baden-Baden converted to the Roman Church and the church of his country had to follow him. Count Palatine Wilhelm of Palatinate-Neuburg converts to the Roman Church and immediately reforms his country back to it. The Senate of Bremen dislikes several Lutheran pastors in the city; it expels them and reforms the city's church system from Lutheran to Reformed.

mirte, may all his neighbors around remain Lutheran, yes, may even the cathedral church in the city remain Lutheran, because he has no power over it; it does not hold him back. Whoever in Bremen was as Lutheran as the citizens of Hamburg could not sit in the Senate, and whoever in Hamburg was as Lutheran as the Senate in Bremen did not receive citizenship. He who was as Protestant in Kassel as the people in Landwehrhagen and Lutterberge two hours to the north, or as the Upper Hessians in Marburg, found no church open there for himself and his fellow churchmen. The state authorities had drawn the church so tightly to themselves, and had placed and shaped it so arbitrarily according to their own well-being, that it was actually only able to breathe in this narrow sphere, in the bondage of this embrace. It had become - according to imperial law - an appendage to the ship of state.

It is true that in the case of later changes of sovereign confession, especially after the Thirty Years' War, the church of the country was no longer forced into the sovereign succession as in former times; Brandenburg, despite the conversion of its Elector to the Reformed Confession, nevertheless remained Lutheran, and Electoral Saxony likewise, despite the fact that its sovereign became Roman. Likewise, the conversion of Brunswick, Würtemberg, and Hesse princes did not bring about any essential change in the church system of their states. But the fact that this did not happen in spite of the papal assurances did not come from a resistance of the churches themselves, which would not have had a sufficient body for this, but rather from the political estates, which had the safeguarding of the church system guaranteed by princely reversals. Indeed, in Electoral Saxony, the sovereign had to cede his supreme ecclesiastical power to several state ministers commissioned and sworn in evangelicis, whom he of course had to elect, and through such a minister, Electoral Saxony strangely continued to preside over the Corpus Evangelicorum at the Imperial Diet even after the transfer.

It is hard to imagine a more inadequate state of law for the prosperous existence of a church system. It is perfectly understandable that no even somewhat satisfactory Protestant ecclesiastical law could be formed in Germany on such foundations. These unchurchlike ecclesiastical principles would have had an almost fatal effect, instead of merely paralyzing it, if they had not found a barrier at least at one point, namely, at the ecclesiastical confession and the ministry of preaching committed to it. But even this barrier had to be crossed. The choice of the authorities who had to watch over it lay entirely in the hands of the sovereigns, and the appointment of the church servants again mostly in the hands of these authorities. If they wanted to bring about any changes, they chose their people accordingly. Paul Gerhard, with his Lutheran confession, found against the rocher de bronze of his reformed sovereign

The Lutheran consistory did not protect him, but he had to emigrate from his parish in Berlin to Lübben in Saxony. At the beginning of the last century, church regiment decisions on church visitations in Magdeburg reprimanded the clergy there under threat of punishment for maintaining conventional Lutheran forms of worship. Faithful servants of the Lutheran Church could find themselves in the position of being able to count at most on the protection of their ecclesiastical superiors and the "patrons" of their church, but no longer on protection, because the patrons were in a different camp, and the superiors appointed by them had to walk very cautiously, as if on slippery ice. .

The sovereign consistories have often been accused of hierarchical desires. Certainly wrongly... The nature of their position is bureaucratic, but not hierarchical. The emphasis of their overall feeling lies, as also their title expresses it - "Royal or Ducal etc. Consistory" - on the state. Consistorium" - on the state side, not on the ecclesiastical, and it is quite in keeping with this if they still preferred to be called a spiritual authority rather than an ecclesiastical authority. It has happened that a state consistory, to which men had applied for conversion from the Roman Church, put all kinds of difficulties in their way, why? - so that it would not appear as if the state government in this country were promoting proselytism. . .

One has gradually become so accustomed to such a state of things that, in spite of all the sad experiences made in it, even in more recent times one has not yet been able to get out of this almost crushing embrace, although the conditions under which that first devotion took place have long since ceased to exist. As long as the state and the ecclesiastical community coincide, it may seem more harmless to place the upper direction and supervision of the ecclesiastical system within the limits of certain ecclesiastical ordinances in the hands of the respective head of state, although this is never an exemplary order, but always only an emergency remedy. In Germany, however, the state system and the church community have long since ceased to coincide. .. Nevertheless, it is not possible to bend out of the once chosen path of hanging the bishop's mantle around the head of state. The Grand Ducal Edict of Baden of 1807 asserts in § 17: "The ecclesiastical power of the Protestant Church of both confessions can only be exercised in the name of the sovereign, to whatever religion he may be personally attached," and then adds, however, with a mitigating effect: "and only by a Superior Consistory appointed by him from members of the Protestant Church. The Consistory later became a "Protestant church section" of the state government, and this in turn became a "Protestant church council," etc., always at the pleasure of the state. But one involuntarily asks

in the above: why only in the name of the sovereign? we think: Christ is the sovereign over his church. All government in her is to be done in the name of JEsu Christ. By what act did he transfer his power to the temporal sovereigns? Our church knows no visible representative of Christ. Episcopal office is church office; church office is church service. Has the sovereign duly prepared himself for this service? Has he solemnly committed himself to this service in Christ's Church?

In Bavaria, the Protestant Church has a Catholic chief bishop in the king. The Protestant Ober-Consistorium sends out its letters with the superscription: In the name of His Majesty the King. The Catholic King has to sign the resolutions of the Protestant General Synod so that they become valid. What abstractions the German genius is capable of! And yet we must confess: perhaps nowhere in all Germany has the State interfered less with the Church than there. But on one occasion the obliquity of the whole situation was to be illuminated with a rather glaring light, when Protestant agitations rose up against the liturgical measures of the High Consistory, which had been examined and approved by all legal ecclesiastical authorities, and appealed with petitions to the Catholic King for protection against the Catholicizing tendencies of their highest church authority. And the king also helped them. .. .

In all these relations the Catholic Church is much freer. This became quite obvious after the great political catastrophe which transformed the Kingdom of Hanover into a Prussian province. The Catholics thereby received a new sovereign in the King of Prussia, the Protestants at the same time a new chief bishop. The latter, under their bishops, continued to go their accustomed way in peace; the latter were immediately caught in the crossfire of the Prussian Union and, after the annexation of their state system, also had to expect an annexation of their church system into the Prussian one. In the case of the latter, their ecclesiastical organism was out of the question; in the case of the latter, it was very much in question, and they had the feeling that everything was on a knife-edge. The Minister of Culture had to leave it up to them how and in what form they wanted to incorporate the church prayer for the new sovereign into their service; to these he sent it formulated according to the Prussian agendas. .

Even if the Hanoverian Consistory is not at first decreed into the Union like the Saxonian, the Pomeranian, etc., Consistory, it is still quite in the hands of His Majesty's Government. *) will be decreed into the Union, yet, according to the present state of affairs, His Majesty's Government has it pretty much in its own hands to gradually shape this authority differently, since the filling of the positions that may become vacant in it belongs to the sovereign. One needs

*) In the province of Saxony there were 11 reformed congregations at the time of the unification, in Pomerania 5, that is 16 among almost 3000 Lutheran congregations.

then only instead of the so-called "confessionalistic" ones, put in so-called mildly well-thinking men, however with "Lutheran direction". With them it would be easier to talk.

One would think that Prussia had so many other things to put in order and to do that it could not feel any inclination to burden itself with a heap of ecclesiastical turmoil on top of its other difficulties, that it would even have to have an interest not to touch these things, not to irritate the sensitivities here, and, if called upon from the circles concerned themselves, even then to intervene only with the gentlest hand. Instead of this it cannot get away from the way of extending its stirring in state and military organizations to the ecclesiastical field also. And its prophets stand behind it and cry aloud: Go ahead! go ahead! that's the way! that's Prussia's job! But the Protestant congregations in Frankfurt a. M. all reject the consequence of this profession, and the French Reformed congregation unanimously declares that it would rather be treated as a sect under the Prussian constitutional charter than place itself under the Royal Consistory at Wiesbaden."

s , w. ----------

Literary Intelligences.

Petros, a sermon preached Nov. 12th 1868 by Joseph A. Seiss. Philadelphia. 1869. 8vo.

A skillful and lively sermon. After the author has rejected the claims that the Roman church tries to derive from his text (Matth. 16, 16-19.), he discusses the principate that the Scripture attaches to the apostle Peter in truth. A principate not of rank or jurisdiction, but one of time. Because Peter was the first whom God called, the first who made a good confession, he also received first what was due to the others who were called as well as to him. - Only about this we would have wished a more definite explanation, whether Dr. Seiß understands by the rock verse 18 with the fathers of the evangelical church: Peter's confession or his person. fPage 21, namely, the one seems to be taught, page 25 the other].

Luther's translation of the holy scriptures. The new testament. By Charles P. Krauth. Philadelphia. 1869. 8vo..

A writing about Luther's translation of the Bible by an Englishman! And by no means a bad one. The author gives a short overview of Luther's educational background (p. 3. 4.), mentions his first attempts at translation (p. 6.) and then describes the great work itself (p. 7 ff.). Further, he tells us about the first printings since Sept. 21, 1522, and about the concurrence translations (p. 16 ff.). Of Hieronymus Emser, Dr. Krauth aptly says: "He possessed the two merits in which many a

translators find the sole proofs of their profession: the language into which he translated, he could not write, and that from which he translated, he did not understand" (p. 17.^. Also page 18, is very edifying to read.

Charles P. Krauth, The reformation, its occasions and cause. Philadelphia. 1869, 8vo.

After a nice description of the day before All Saints' Day 1517 in Wittenberg, the author gives the root from which the Reformation grew: God's Word. And we would like to recommend this description especially to our compatriots on the other side of the great water, who have allowed themselves to be told by their theologians that the Reformation had two so-called principles, a formal and a material one. The manner in which Dr. Krauth speaks of Zwingli (pp. 103. 105.) has pleased us less. Also, his judgment on the pre-Lutheran German Bibles (p. 105.) is too harsh. We ask to read only the translation of the First Epistle to the Corinthians in the ninth (High) German Bible. In general, the author lacks a vivid view of the history of the German language before Luther.

Woof and proof No. 1. Luther's Catechism with explanations.

Part I. The ten commandments. Philadelphia. Lutheran book-store. 1868. 12mo.

A well-meant enterprise, though not worthy of our applause in every respect. For there is a faint Judaistic streak running through the scripture. The fourth commandment, for example, reads: Honor thy father and mother, that thou mayest live long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. In the explanation of the third commandment, the author means that the seventh day must always be free from work, even in the New Testament. The whole change that has taken place under the new covenant with the third commandment consists in the exchange of the day. The inspired apostles had set the first day for the seventh, and everything else remained the same. (Page 24Z We urge the editor to examine the whole question again carefully, following the guidance of the 28th Article of the Augsburg Confession.

Miscellencies.

"Higher Unity and Consensus Theology" now play a great part in Germany. Ströbel comes to this subject in a review of Dr. J. A. Dorner's paper, "Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie. München 1867," which is found in this year's second quarterly issue of Guericke's Zeitschrift. Among other things, it says: "We do not consider it advisable, let alone necessary, to speak of the history of Protestant theology in a splayed posture.

(Hagemann.) Moreover, the whole procedure is based only on rhetorical deception. It is based on the idea that we are to stand on the shoulders of ancient opposites and to climb higher and higher as vain seekers of unity and truth, until we finally find on the highest, dizzying step, instead of the promised theological millennium, only the justly infamous yes-and-no theology. (Hagemann.) Moreover, the whole procedure is based only on rhetorical deception. The true consensus of two confessions or religions cannot be found by accepting a third one, which is really or supposedly above them, but only lost; for the absorption in a higher unity is for all concerned a change of principles, a giving up of their spirit, life, and character, of their existence. How can there still be talk of a consensus between two confessions or communities when both have ceased to exist? Surely one does not call a peacemaking by the death or suicide of the contending adversaries: emphasis of the consensus existing between them! Historically, no concordia, no ecclesiastical harmony, has ever come about in this way, nor has it ever been sought. Of course, we are speaking here of right, Christian attempts at unity that have arisen from religious reasons and needs, not of the dishonest machinations of ambition, imperiousness, and contempt for God. . . . . just as little do we see any reason to blame those of our fathers or brothers in the faith who in three fatal cases offered notable resistance to the temptations of higher unity; on the contrary, we feel obliged to thank them most sincerely. Glory to the heroes of the faith who once rejected Islam, the higher standpoint above Christianity, Judaism and paganism; they have saved the ecumenical Christian faith. Glory to the heroes of the faith who once rejected the Interim, the higher unity of Reformation and Pabstry; they have saved the evangelical Protestant faith for us. Glory to the faithful witnesses of truth who, in the first half of our century, rejected the Union, the higher point of view of unification above all religions; they have saved us the only consolation in life and death; their example, like that of their predecessors, shines with strength and encouragement through the bleak times of church history. . . . Complete agreement of Lutherans and Reformed with regard to the evangelical formal as well as material principle! - is then the theme of Dr. D.'s History of Protestant Theology, recurring in innumerable variations. Here a double illusion is at play. For once, those two principles are not at all common. Whoever has examined and compared the Lutheran Catechism on the one hand, and the Heidelberg Catechism on the other, according to their internal course and connections, knows that the one rests on a different religious material principle than the other. Two different material principles, however, cannot be traced back to one and the same formal principle; their difference points precisely to two

sources and standards. One must only not be blinded by appearances. Of the holy Scriptures and justification the Reformers speak almost in the same terms as the Lutherans. Of course, the Reformed speak of Holy Scripture and justification in almost the same terms as the Lutherans; but this does not settle the question of principles. It is rather the same with this as with the three astronomical systems. Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Tycho have in common the sun, moon, earth, and all other world bodies, also their distances, periods of revolution, etc.; nevertheless, there is a fundamental disagreement. Just as we are dealing here with geocentric and heliocentric positions and their consequences, so it is analogous with the Lutheran and Reformed systems of religion. When the holy Scriptures were translated by the Wittenbergers into the Bible, it was a question of geocentrism. If the Holy Scriptures are placed in the center of the doctrine of salvation by the Wittenbergers, and in the periphery by the Swiss, there is nevertheless a formal-principal dichotomy, even though the bibliology is quite the same. And this is how it is in factual reality; all counter-arguments do not change this. And if, in consequence of this eccentricity, Zwingli places the glory of God, or Calvin predestination, in the place where justification by faith is found in Luther, there is a material-principle difference, which is not changed by Dr. D.'s repeated reference to the "glory of God" and predestination, which were also emphatically emphasized by Luther, and is still less removed by a denial of their equally factual existence. This formal and material principle is exclusively peculiar to the German reform; the Swiss, because it has a different spirit, has therefore also a different principle. To designate this difference between the two simply and truthfully, one should speak of the Evangelical Lutheran and the legally Reformed Church."

The difference between a Protestant and a Roman preacher is correctly stated by the author of the paper, "Gottes Wort gegen Menschenwort" (Augsburg, 1867), as follows: "The Roman priests preach, we also; they preach in honor of the Most Sacred Heart of Mary, in honor of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, about trust in Mary, about Mary's death, about Mary's service, about Mary-Virgin, about Mary-Mother, about Mary-Queen, they preach Mary my light, Mary my star, Mary my sun, Mary my flower, Mary my ring, Mary my image, Mary my weapon, Mary my song, Mary my anchor, Mary my refuge, Mary my dwelling, Mary my dove, Mary my sister,- we preach Christ Crucified."

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The new era of the General Synod. We are now living in the time of Reconstruction. How would it be possible that the "**Obser**

ver" should not also be reconstructed. The whole General Synod is to be reconstructed and

nothing less than a new era of the same can be brought about. Thus, under the above title, the *Observer of* May 14 writes: "The Gederalsynod must be reconstructed to a considerable extent. Accordingly, it must become aware of itself as a Lutheran body, assert a corresponding self-respect, and preserve unharmed the rich heritage entrusted to it. It must better guard its gates of admission, be more cautious with synodal approvals, accept nothing on good faith, order an honest acceptance of its basis in the prescribed form, without qualification, limitation, or proprietary interpretation. She must hold her ecclesiastical banner, the Augustana, in unsullied honor, and tolerate no rival banner at any of her synods. She must show herself to be the faithful guardian of Lutheran doctrine, Lutheran principles of worship and church government, Lutheran customs and usages. It must take due care to maintain unity in the faith with regard to the Fundamental Articles and to limit freedom whenever it should overstep its non-undamental bounds and rush recklessly toward anarchy. It must stop the centrisugal force of unrestrained individualism, which tends to alienation and disintegration, and steel the centripetal force of Christian churchmanship, which leads to unity and strength, to harmony and stirring, to steadfastness and glory. To accomplish this, it must adopt and recognize only One Symbol and One Manner of Signing, One Liturgy, which at times secures a single order of worship, One Form of Church Government and Discipline for Synods and Congregations, One Catechism, which communicates the same fundamental truths and plants the same system of Christian instruction. Only in this way, in our humble opinion, can the General Synod develop the essential characteristics of a Lutheran general body, namely, corresponding unity in doctrine, healthy uniformity in practice, necessary agreement in character, and harmonious cooperation in action." So the "*Observer*" himself notices that much, much would have to happen before the new era would come about. If only this ecclesiastical reconstruction does not end up like the political one. One almost feels tempted by all this to proclaim with Shakespeare: **Much ado about nothing**, if one did not unfortunately have to worry that worse than nothing might come out of it. - C.

What advice the "*Observer*" gives us on the usury question. He comes to speak of it on the occasion of a mocking description of the pastoral conference of the Eastern District of our Synod held in Philadelphia, of which he had read from Brobst's "Magazine". There, then, in his number of May 14, he writes: "From the report of the 'Magazine^, meager as it is, we learn that among the most seriously discutirtcn subjects was the usury question. From their meetings at St. Louis, Fort Wayne, and Chicago, it seems, the Missourians came out strongly against the morality of taking interest on borrowed money, and, of course, of paying interest (?). This, then, was insisted upon at Philadelphia. Past. Brobst, sensitive as he is, deplores and denounces this new "point," the sweetest in the series, as disastrous for Missouri Lutheranism in the East, because it reaches too deeply into life - apparently he wants to say into the pocket. For this reason he advised the brethren, whose "guest" he was, to quickly change sail, turn the ship around, and steer in the opposite direction. We do not like to appear as people who meddle in the affairs of others, but it seems to us that these strangely well disposed Missourians would be of far better service to mankind if they would put a stop to the incurring of debts, in which case, as there would be neither interest nor capital to pay, the usury question would never arise." - For once the good "*Observer*" does not and cannot understand us.

He probably already sees us in spirit with a giant petition to ban usury before Congress. Well, then he could bring in his clever idea as an amendment. We do not intend to plow with his calf, do not engage in politics at all, but have to do with the Christian conscience, which recognizes the Holy Scriptures as the only rule and guide of life and faith. - C.

Licensing System. According to the report in the **Evangelical Lutheran of** 20 May, at the recent meeting of the North Carolina Synod, its president also moved, among other things, that "Synod consider whether it is not proper to abolish the licensing system. I believe that it is un-Lutheran and has no basis in Scripture. Moreover, it has a detrimental effect in that it opens the door for those who are only imperfectly prepared to become messengers of Christ and to show the spiritually blind the way to life and salvation. If there is not a good deal of knowledge connected with personal piety, I cannot see how the work of the ministry can be carried on with the strength and enlightened zeal of a worker who has nothing to be ashamed of. For this reason I recommend the complete abolition of the licensing system, and further advise that the Synod determine in its constitution the minimum of grammar school and theological studies which candidates for the office of preacher must have attained before they can be entrusted with the sacred office." - The committee report in question hereupon read, as follows: "Since we can find no authority for the licensing system in God's Word and no support in our Lutheran Confession and practice, and since the same has only been instituted in this country as a provisional usage to procure preachers quickly, be it resolved: To amend our Constitution so as to abolish from this day forth the practice of licensing candidates of the preaching ministry before their ordination. C.

On the Confessional State of the English Episcopal Church. About this the "**Lutheran** Standard" in its number of May 15, takes from an Episcopal

The 39 Articles are never used in our services. The clergy, whose office it is to teach, must study them and believe them. It would be well that they should be studied by the laity also, since they are the dogmatic expression of the truth of Scripture. But they do not occupy such a position as the **Covenant of Faith**, be it what it may, to which people must subscribe if they wish to become members of a Congregational body. Nowhere are they declared to be a part of the Christian or Catholic faith. Communicants are not required to believe the same, except those articles which contain doctrines of the Apostolic Symbol, nor even to profess the same. They do not constitute the faith into which infants are baptized." Not badly does the "Standard" remark on this: "Naturally the question suggests itself whether the Episcopal preachers must believe what God's Word does not teach, or whether the laity must not believe what God's Word teaches." - C.

Methodist Fanaticism. The **Lutheran Standard** reports in the same number: "The Methodist Conference, recently assembled at Middletown, Conn., passed the following resolution; The sacramental use of intoxicating wine is often attended with grave danger to those whose craving for stimulating beverages can only be restrained by entire abstinence. Therefore, the desirability and even the legality of this use should be carefully considered." The "*Standard*" rightly makes the following remark: "One must be astonished that men in their presumption can go so far as to reproach a divine institution as being unprofitable, or even unlawful, and can even be so far as to say that it is unjust.

But they keep on saying that they have such a deep respect for the Bible. Or do these people think that the wine the Lord used was sugar water ?

Synod of Pennsylvania. From one in the published report on the sessions of this Synod in May of this year, we learn: "Rev. A. H. Achenbach, delegate of the Eastern Synod of the German Reformed Church, spoke to the Synod on the fraternal relations of the two denominations to each other, to which the President responded in an appropriate manner. - The President announced (later) the following appointments: Delegates to the German Reformed Synod, the Rvds. W. J. Eyer and J. M. Anspach." - This is what we simple-minded Germans call LutheranUnionifterei. It may be un-American, of course, not to practice such things. -

W.

The General Assemblies of the Presbyterians of the old and new schools at their recent meeting declared themselves almost unanimously in favor of a union of their respective churches. Only seven votes were cast against it in the General Assembly of the old school, and the "basis" was unanimously adopted by the new. The following four points form the basis for the union:

1. The Old and New Testaments are considered the rule of faith.
2. The Westminster Confession and Catechism, with slight modifications in regard to civil law, are adopted as a full and accurate interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. Scripture.
3. The United Church adopts the Presbyterian Church Order.
4. It adopts psalmody and prescribes its use.

According to last year's statistical reports, the old school has 2,330 preachers and 252,555 members; the new school 1,870 preachers and 184,687 members. The presbyteries will doubtless vote in favor of a union.

(Christl. Botsch.)

Terrible. The terrible consequences of the unconscionability of American women who criminally seek to prevent their becoming mothers are revealed in a report to the legislature by Mr. Warren Johnson, superintendent of the state schools at Marne. He reports that for 10 years the number of pupils has decreased by 16,683 children, aged from 4 to 21 years. Last year the number of school children decreased by 3182, and in 1866 by 4141. Mr. Johnson asks some questions professing "his" horror at the terrible modern crime of infanticide, by which in 10 years the number of children has been diminished by 16,683, and during the last yearly by 4000. (Evangelist.)

The Northern Methodists, through their bishops, officially inquired of the Southern Methodists whether steps could not be taken to reunite them, since the cause of separation had now been removed. The Southern bishops have replied that the cause of the separation has not yet been removed, for it was not slavery that was the real cause, but the interference of the church authorities in political and social affairs. Also, the last offer of the Southerners to unite in 1848 had been rejected by the Northerners. There was still too little friendship between the two church bodies to hope for blessings from a union. They should strive to cultivate love and friendship, and then they could unite later. (Evangelist.)

Philanthropy. The Kansas Legislature appropriated $1,400 for the purchase of tobacco and K300 for the salary of a preacher for the convicts in the penitentiaries. Let us hope the readers of the "Evangelist" will divide their expenses better. (Evangelist.)

The *Christian Intelligencer* reports that nearly one-fourth of the Dutch English Reformed preachers are without parishes, and that among the old-school Presbyterians there are 800 preachers, many of whom have been waiting year and day for a call.

(Evangelist.)

A Methodist conference in New York has licensed a certain Mrs. Van Cott to the preaching ministry, and, it seems, this example will find more imitation, for it harmonizes perfectly with the mad women's rights movement now rampant throughout the country. - (Evangelist.)

The Protestants or so-called Albrechtsbrueder have recently been complaining about the decrease in the number of members. In the "Christlicher Botschafter" (Christian Messenger) of June 9 we read, among other things, the following: "In the conference reports of last year, 2990 members are reported as having moved away and only 1231 as having been admitted with a certificate; 1759 members have thus been dismissed from the conferences who have not been readmitted to the community in their new home. But how is it that we lose so many of the members who move from the boundaries of one conference to those of another? Last year's loss - 1759 - should cause us to think seriously. Let us point out several causes. First, among those who have moved from the Eastern Conferences are many English members who do not always find English congregations of our church in the Western Conferences and therefore find it necessary to join (another) English church. Others of these English brethren, however, no longer want to join us in their new home. Secondly, many members are moving to areas where we have no congregations and where there is no prospect of congregations being planted in the near future. Thousands of members have already been lost to us in this way. Does it not show a worldly sense when members, for the sake of supposed worldly gain, move their homes to areas where they must do without church privileges? Many have proved by the choice of their new home that they love and esteem the Evangelical Community very little. Thirdly, there are some who allow themselves to be entangled by opportunities to become rich, become worldly, godless, and care little for God or church in their new homes."

Conversion. It is reported from Dresden that the former Franciscan priest Clemens Jäger from Prague, who converted to the Lutheran Church in Dresden, preached there in the Lutheran Court Church after passing his exams.

Secret Societies. The General Conference of the so-called "United Brethren in Christ," at its meeting in May of this year, decreed: "That if any preacher or member unites with a secret society, or is such a member at the time of his admission into the church, but refuses to obey the exhortations of his brethren to desist from it, he shall be expelled after the lapse of six months." It is certainly not to the credit of the ecclesiastical communities, which wish to be Lutheran, that they allow themselves to be decidedly surpassed by some sects in earnestness against the secret societies, which are so pernicious and sinful.

II. foreign countries.

Correspondence from Hanover. In a letter dated May 1 we receive the following news from Hanover: "Here we seem to fall from one sadness into another. Since the annexations, the floods of the Union have been pouring over the churches, which until now had remained free of them. Dams against it - are almost not there. According to the public papers from America, the unchurched spirit of our people is considered the most important bridge for the Union. Who would also want the foregoing

deny the existence of this bridge and misjudge its usefulness for the Union. But our people are not as unchurched as they are thought to be over there. Its exaltation of the old wretched catechism, its anger at the new one, only provides a very one-sided measure of the elevation of church life in our people. Compare Brunswick, which is certainly not ecclesiastically higher, but lower than Hanover, where a good new catechism is accepted and used without resistance. Now, in the face of the Union, our most dangerous enemy is not the people, but that the Church lacks determined and resolute champions. Take a closer look, dear Professor, at the anti-Unionist movement which led to the great Lutheran Conference here in Hanover last summer. There Arndt in Wernigerode and the member of the Prussian church regiment Biek in Erfurt registered as Lutherans and as fighters against the Union. In both places there are congregations of so-called separated Lutherans, who have left the congregation of which Arndt is pastor and the one to which Biek belongs, because they declare them to be unchurched. Now, in addition to Biek and Arndt, their separated counter-pastors did not appear in Hanover, but Moraweck from Pomerania did appear from the synod to which they belong, and Zöller and Frommet from the Immanuel synod, which has again separated from the latter. These all now get along with the various rulers and teachers of the Lutheran regional churches; a general rush for unity ensues. No one seemed to have time to consider that, if these people were all equally good Lutherans, it would be a mortal sin according to Scripture for them to maintain schisms among themselves at home, and that the so-called Vereinslutherans in Prussia maintained communion at home with the lovers of the Union and with the Reformed. If the time for sobriety was lacking then, it might well have come within a year. But the committee of that great Lutheran conference, which has now met in Brunswick, has just accepted the Union Lutheran Arndt into its midst, and next to him - Huschke. Not only will he certainly not come, but he will also testify to the fraud. Otherwise he would have to deny his entire past and the existence of his church. But will it help? The Union spirit has penetrated too many; or perhaps more correctly: the Lutheran spirit has seized too few. - Our people here in Hanover, as I have said, behave more defensively than accommodatingly against the Union (with the exception of the Protestant Unionists, who do not count). Our church government is making a gruff front against the Union - in its own way, opening one door after another to it, without, it seems, knowing or wanting to know what it is doing. By the way, we must wait and see what God will do with his church here. If he wants to break it off, he will know how to save those who do not succumb to the seduction of time in a small boat. But it behooves us not to flee from the ship before God destroys it, but to fight with our little strength against storm and waves and leaks and the ship's men, who themselves chase it onto the cliffs."

Pusey and the Lutheran Church. The Erlanger Zeitschrift of May of this year writes: "When in the summer of 1867 a larger article on the "mutual communion with the Scandinavian Church" appeared in the **Guardian**, the most widespread ecclesiastical magazine in England, Pusey sent the following article to the editors for printing: "I am requested by various persons, clergy and laity alike, who are of one mind with me, to ask you for the inclusion of a few lines concerning a matter which, in our opinion, is of the highest importance for our Church. A powerful party, which, according to our opinion, throws itself merely on the question of how far Sweden has the episcopal succession or Denmark will be ready to accept it from us, has for some time been agitating for the English church to take over the Scandinavian communities (**bodies, for the** Puseyites do not want any church in Sweden to be a part of them).

We know that any such recognition would be highly detrimental to any hope of reunion with the Orthodox Eastern Church, for which many of your readers longingly pray. We know that any such recognition would be highly detrimental to any hope of reunion with the Orthodox Eastern Church, for which many of your readers pray with longing. For the Eastern Church has condemned Lutheranism as heretical. We are also convinced that any such tacit recognition of the Lutheran errors, even if it were out of ignorance of them, would be highly detrimental to our own claim to catholicity and would even make many waver in their loyalty to their own church, as the connection with the King of Prussia used to do for the bishopric in Jerusalem. We therefore beg the above-named persons, by the mercy of Christ, not to do violence to our consciences by endeavoring to obtain such recognition from the bishops who will meet in September, and we hope that a memorandum will be delivered to these bishops rejecting all recognition so long as that communion retains the Lutheran symbolic books, which we believe contain only heresy, from which God in grace has preserved us. I have lately (in ***Essays on the reunion of Christendom,*** to which writers of the Latin, Greek, and English Churches have contributed) set forth some of the reasons which fill me with distrust even of the Swedish Succession. I have indicated some, though only some, of the Lutheran heresies. Now I am too busy with other unfinished works to enter into controversy. And what I have said here should be nothing more than an admonition to others to spare our consciences. All that matters to me here is to express a conviction, not to open an argument." -

July 29, 1867. E. B. Pusey.

Italy. Rome. [A kind of program for the decisions of the Council is now being circulated, as it is said to have been communicated to the ecclesiastical dignitaries. The program contains 13 articles, and among them those concerning the personal infallibility of the pope and the temporal power. Article 9 states that the dogma of the infallibility of the pope and his supremacy over the ecumenical council shall be defined. Article 2 states that the doctrine of the moral necessity of the temporal power of the pope, confirmed by all the bishops in the General Council, will have the most salutary effects on the ideas of princes and peoples, will strengthen the power of the church, and will sooner or later bring about the restitution of the provinces usurped by the revolution. Article 10 states that the Council shall put an end to the innumerable abuses and reprehensible customs which have crept into certain churches, kingdoms, and also into some religious orders. These are the most radical propositions, although there are several others which also involve a significant revolution against the previous views. It is to be noted, however, that the very extravagance of these propositions established by the Jesuits is said to have caused offence among numerous bishops and prelates, and to have provoked a rather serious opposition to the Council itself. -

(Mg. Church Gazette.)

Death. On June 3, Prof. E. W. Hengstenberg, the editor of the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung," which he edited for more than 40 years, died at the age of 67.

>>> Addendum to the article "Lic. Dr. Preuß". Just at the end of this issue, a certificate issued under his official seal, requested earlier by Director Dr. Ranke, about the effectiveness of Dr. Preuß at the Gymnasium and about his departure from the Gymnasium in December 1868, arrives here, which agrees with the description given above. D. R.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 15. August 1869. No. 8.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 33.

Although a preacher has to care for the spiritual needs of the members of his church, he also has to care for the physical well-being, especially for the needs of the poor, sick, widows, orphans, the infirm, the needy, the aged etc.. Gal. 2, 9. 10. cf. Acts 6, 1. ff. 11, 30. 12, 25. 24, 17. Rom. 12, 8. 13. Jam. 1, 27. 1 Tim. 5, 10. 1 Thess. 4, 11. 12.

Note 1.

This is an extremely important point, especially here. Like a terrible cancer, the secret societies eat away at the body of the church; thousands upon thousands join them at first, mostly for the sole purpose of securing support and help for themselves in times of want, sickness, and other need, but the consequence is that they finally become alienated from the church altogether and regard their secret society as a better bearer of true, because active, religion than the church. Now the fundamental cause of this is unbelief and lack of Christian knowledge and a sharpened conscience; but at the same time a principal cause is that the Christian congregations do not do what they are obliged to do in regard to those of their members who are in bodily distress. People know that, though they are members of a Christian congregation, yet they are abandoned in want, sickness, and other distresses; so, unawakened as they are, they join societies which hold out to them the prospect of certain help in time of bodily need. How much this does dishonor to the church and to the word of God is not to be said. The apostle writes to the Christians in Thessa

lonrch: "Strive to be quiet, and to do your own work, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you: that ye all may walk uprightly toward them which are without, and have no need of them." 1 Thess. 4, 11. 12. God's word, then, intends that Christians should strive to get into a position in which they are not compelled to avail themselves of the charity of those "who are without." Hedinger therefore adds to the words, "That ye have no need of them," the remark, "Either of the people themselves, or of their goods, help, and encouragement. Paul would have them work for themselves in blessing, that they should not look into the hands of the ungodly; which would be a mockery to them, an offence to their faith, and a seduction to their souls through conversation." But it is clear that when Christians would like to work and thus eat their own bread, but are unable to do so and are therefore compelled to appeal to the charity of unbelievers, it is not they, but the congregation of which they are members, who are to blame for the trouble thus given to the world and for the disgrace which thus comes upon the gospel. The zeal of a congregation against the secret societies is an evidently Pharisaical one, if it is not connected with zeal for sufficient provision for their poor and miserable. A Christian congregation must not plead that there are state funds for the poor and poorhouses, to the maintenance of which it also contributes. No Christian community should have its poor cared for in this way; the state should rather see that it does not have to impose taxes for the poor by force in order to maintain the poor Christians, but only those who would otherwise be abandoned by all the 'world. The Christian community should consider it a disgrace to see its poor cared for by the secular state. In the so-called state churches, however, in which a fusion of the church with the state took place, it was a different matter. There the state institutions for the poor were actually those of the church. Here, where church and state are strictly separated, the church should not allow itself to be deprived of caring for its poor by itself and alone. If God already called out to the church of the Old Covenant: "Let there be no beggar among you," Deut. 15:4, how much more does this apply to the church of the New Testament! Is it dishonorable to God when Christians have to go about as beggars among Christians, because they are not given and lent what they need, so that Christ has to go begging in them? How shameful it must be for the Christian name when Christians, because their brethren close their hearts to them, have to go begging from the unloving world! Seidel writes: "That the care of the poor has been entrusted to the ministry of preaching from the earliest times of the church, and that it has had the order and supervision of poorhouses and hospitals, there can be no doubt, if we consider that in the *Codice Justiniano there is* always mention of the poor and poorhouses.

The first part of the book is a book with the title 'Of the Bishops and *Clerics*'. At the time of the Reformation, therefore, the care of the poor was, as is fair, included among the episcopal rights of the sovereigns and transferred by them to the ecclesiastical courts. These courts, however, have made the order that the money collected for the poor and other charitable donations are to be administered by the preacher and the authorities of each place through certain superintendents appointed for this purpose, but in such a way that the poor's affairs may never be mixed with the common affairs of the city; also the inspection of all *pia corpora has* been reserved to the superintendents and constoriis". (Pastoraltheol. 1, 11, § 1. p. 197. f.) So further Luther writes concerning the history of the establishment of a special office of almoner in the apostolic church at Jerusalem (Acts 6, 1. ff.): "In this history you see, first of all, how a Christian congregation is to be constituted; in addition you see quite a picture of a spiritual regiment which the apostles lead here. They care for souls, preach and pray, but also see to it that the body is cared for; they raise up some men to distribute the goods, as you have heard. Thus the Christian government feeds the people both in body and soul, so that no one lacks anything, and all are abundantly fed and well provided for both in body and soul." (Church Post. XI, 2754. f.)

Note 2.

That the care for the poor belongs to the special duties of preachers is clear from Gal. 2, 9. 10. and Acts 6, 1. ff. Therefore, as often as our ancient theologians list the official duties of a preacher, they also include the care of the poor. (*Cf. J. Gerhard, loc. th. de minister, ecclesiast. §* 265.) Concerning the remarkable passage Gal. 2, 9. 10. Luther remarks: "When a faithful shepherd or pastor has supplied his people with the preaching of the gospel above all things, he should not thereafter leave any thing so diligently to his care as that the poor also may be fed and sustained. For this is never lacking where there is a church or congregation of God, there must certainly also be poor, who alone are the righteous disciples of the gospel; as Christ himself testifies Matth. 11, 5: 'To the poor the gospel is preached'; and 1 Cor. 1:27, 28: 'Which is foolish in the sight of the world,' etc. For wicked men and the devil persecute the church and congregation of God, and make many poor people, who afterward are thus forsaken, that no man will take care of them, nor give any." (VIII, 1762.) L. Hartmann writes: "As in a herd the needy sheep require greater and more abundant help on the part of their shepherd (Ezech. 34, 4.), so in the parishes miserable persons require, of-

The same poor, especially when they are sick, widows, orphans, and others who have been abandoned and oppressed by others, need the special help and care of their pastors and rightly expect it from them. For although Christian love demands this duty also from the rest, yet the pastor is obliged to bear fatherly care for the miserable persons before others, and must not persuade himself that it is enough that they receive support from the rulers of God's treasury, but must take care of the soul and conscience of the poor, so that they do not fall away from the Gospel because of lack of their necessities of life, go elsewhere, or envy the richer. Therefore the pastor must, according to Paul's example, also make frequent exhortations to collections for the poor, Gal. 2, 10. As Paul therefore points the Corinthians to the example of the Galatians, so the habit of one congregation inspires the other, since we by nature are less inclined to do what is not customary elsewhere, but the zeal for love of many others stems from sloth. . . Above all, therefore, the pastor must diligently inquire which of his own are wretched persons who deserve to be pitied. ... . For this purpose, the pastor must have a list of the poor drawn up by himself and the overseers, and must diligently investigate whether anyone is impoverished due to illnesses, food shortages, or other misfortunes, in order to support them from the congregation's poor fund and from his own resources. Then he shall see to it that the pastors carefully collect the income which is drawn from the poor estates, as well as the voluntary offerings which are collected on Sundays in the church services, at weddings or at funerals, and distribute the collected alms with such prudence and faithfulness that they, as much as possible, do not let anyone lack or do anything here guided by partisan love and hatred or also by self-interest (if, for example, the poor render services to the pastor for free). Therefore, the pastor must exhort his pastors in times of trouble, when contagious diseases are rampant, or when times are difficult for other reasons, so that they will think of caring for the poor more thoroughly. And in order that the pastor may preserve his reputation and fidelity and prove it to all, he must, with the mutual consent and counsel of the presbytery, carry out these parts of his office and give account of them in due time. If then the pastor and the almoners, while they are well aware of honest administration, are unjustly pulled through and innocently slandered by some poor, to whom one can never give enough, or also by some other people, then they must not give the least for it, nor slacken in their zeal for office, but rather think, as it is said in the proverb: He who builds by the way has many masters." (*Pastoral, Ev. Ill, 54. p. 1023. sqq.*)

Note 3.

The preacher should see to it that in his congregation, especially if it is a populous one, the affairs of the poor are properly ordered and that almoners appointed for the proper administration of the same are employed according to the example of the congregation at Jerusalem Acts 6:1 ff. and provided with suitable instruction. Luther writes to the author: "This is a very fine picture and example, and it would be good to start it this way, if there were people who would divide a city, like this one, into four or five parts, and give each part a preacher and several deacons, who would supply the same part with preaching and distribute the goods, visit sick people, and see to it that no one suffers from lack. But we do not have the persons to do this, therefore I do not dare to attempt it until our Lord God makes Christians." (XI, 2755.) About the ecclesiastical offices apart from the ministry of the Word, there will be occasion later to deal more fully.

Note 4.

About the persons who are to be counted among those who are to be supported and received by the congregation, and about the nature of the support, we share the following testimonies. Already in the year 1520 Luther wrote in his writing: "Von des christlichen Standes Besserung" ("On the improvement of the Christian state") among other things the following: "It is probably one of the greatest need, that all begging would be stopped in all Christendom, no one should ever go begging among the Christians; it would also be easy to make an order about it, if we had the courage and seriousness to do so, namely that every city*) would provide for its poor people and would not allow any foreign beggar, they could be called whatever they wanted, they would be forest brothers or begging orders. Any town could feed its own people, and even if it were too small, the people in the surrounding villages would be exhorted to give to it. Otherwise they would have to feed so many peasants and bad boys under the beggar's name; so one could also know which ones were truly poor or not. So there would have to be a steward or guardian, who would know all the poor, and what they needed would be announced to the council or priest, or how this could best be arranged. . . But that some think that the poor are not well provided for in this way, and that not so great stone houses and monasteries are built, nor so abundantly, I almost believe. But it is not necessary. He that would be poor ought not to be rich; but if he would be rich, let him take hold of the plough with his hand, and pluck it out of the earth himself. It is enough for the poor to be provided for, so that they do not die of hunger or freeze to death. It is not fitting that one should go to

*) According to our conditions in the Free Church, for "any city" we would have to say "any congregation".

If a man be idle in another man's work, and be rich, and live well in another man's life, as now the wrong abuse goeth. For St. Paul says in 2 Thess. 3:10, He that worketh not shall not eat. No one is ordained of God to live on other people's goods, but only the preaching and ruling priests (as Paul 1 Cor. 9, 14.) for their spiritual work. Luk 10, 7." (X, 367. f.) Thus, further, Porta writes: "If it be asked to whom, or to what people, it is proper to give, thou hast in holy Scripture doctrine and instruction enough hereunto. For in Deuteronomy 5, chapter 15, it is thus written: If any of thy brethren be poor in any city of thy land, which the LORD thy God shall give thee? Let it be known that the LORD God saith by Moses, If any man be poor in thy city or in thy land, thou shalt open thine hand, and give him. Wherefore also the church sings, Thou shalt open thy hand of mercy unto the poor of thy country, etc. For with this he wants to especially command us the poor who are among us, as the sick and infirm, or who because of their age or impossibility cannot earn their bread, or if any house poor, spoiled craftsmen and workers, who have not drunk away their own, have eaten, gambled away or wantonly killed, or have got into damage and accident because of special misfortune, even if they work at the same time, cannot get away and therefore have to suffer hardship, are present. Item, poor widows, orphans, poor diligent students, who have a good report from their preceptoribus, to them one should give in particular." (Pastorale Lutheri. Ed. by Crämer. p. 1082. f.) To be sure, every individual Christian should show his charity toward everyone, also toward strangers (also foreign believers); but first, he should do this in such a way as to do good "most of all to the comrades of faith"; and secondly, it is to be remembered that the alms fund of the congregation is not established both for the support of the poor in general and of the congregation poor, therefore, as a rule, only these are to be supported from it. *)

Hartmann, loc. cit. p. 1026-34, deals thoroughly and in detail with the distinction to be made between worthy and unworthy alms-percipients, but he writes: "Since there is a distinction among the poor, especially among the beggars, prudence is certainly necessary, so that the unworthy are not strengthened in their wickedness; but since we are not men of the heart, we must take care that one does not take one for a beggar.

*) According to Deyling in 1715 even a royal-churf. mandate appeared, which under threat of a fine of 10 Thalers forbade the preachers to issue certificates and letters of recommendation to wandering beggars. (*Institut, prud. pastoral,* p. 714.) In any case, it is unjust, and a very shrewd mercy, to charge a person who desires support only hurriedly to others without examination.

Unworthy esteem him that is worthy, therefore it is better to give to the unworthy than to turn from a worthy; if one is not worthy, yet he is needy."

Note 5.

Concerning the sick, it is the preacher's duty to see to it that they are not only given the necessary means of support if they are poor, but that they are also given the necessary medical treatment, refreshment, maintenance and care; the latter he must also provide under certain circumstances for those who do not lack means, but who lack suitable persons for maintenance, care, night guards, etc. In apostolic times a special office seems to have been established in some larger churches for the care of the sick. Calov writes about the words: "If any man pray for mercy, let him do it with pleasure" (Rom. 12, 8.): "Here we speak of the office which concerns the sick and others in need. Those who have mercy are those who have the care of the sick, the miserable, the exiled. Now, although this might be generally understood of those who exercise this care and mercy privately, as well as of those who are appointed to it, and are bound to it by public office, yet here it is really spoken of such ecclesiastical offices, for which also godly widows were used, 1 Tim. 5, 9. Acts 6, 1." (*Bibl. illustr. ad 1. c.*) Where there is no such office of nurse, every Christian member of the church, by virtue of his membership, is obliged to take over the functions of this office, or to see that they are taken over in his stead.

(To be continued.)

On the infallibility of the pope.

Since the question of papal infallibility is the most important of those which the forthcoming Roman Council will have to consider, it is appropriate that we turn our attention to it at this time. For it seems indeed as if the bishops were determined now to recognize for their part the infallibility*) already claimed by Pius IX in 1863. At least this is indicated by the general, partly joyful approval with which they greeted the papal encyclical of December 8, 1864. This strange encyclical, in which he declares: "We cannot pass over the boldness of those with silence,

*) Deiparae virginis in sua conceptione de teterrimo humani generis hoste victoriam. . Pius nonus pontifex maximus totius ecclesiae votis annuens statuit supremo suo atque infallibili oraculo solemniter proclamare. In festo imm. conc. b. Mariae virginis lect. VI. offlc. edit. d. XXV Sept. a. 1863. pag. 4.

who maintain that, so long as they do not touch the dogmas of faith and morals, a man may refuse to assent to and obey the judgments and decrees of the apostolic see, which have for their object the general welfare of the church, its rights, and its discipline, without sinning, and without in any way impairing his catholic sentiments. How much this doctrine runs counter to the Catholic dogma of the full power conferred on the Roman Pontiff by our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, to pasture, guide, and govern the universal Church, everyone will clearly see and understand." *)

Accordingly, the pope first demands obedience in matters concerning faith and morals. But he is by no means satisfied with this. Rather, all his decrees are to be obeyed. He says, to be sure, to all which have for their object the general welfare of the Church, her rights, and her discipline. But what papal decree would not have as its object the good of the Church!

And in the syllabus linked to the aforementioned encyclical, the Pope calls the following sentence erroneous: "The obligation which binds Catholic teachers and writers in general is limited to that which is established by the infallible pronouncement of the Church as an article of faith to be held by all." †) So here too: unconditional obedience! And strangely, close behind the aforementioned 22nd "error," this other is condemned: "The Roman popes and the general conciliar have exceeded the limits of their authority, usurped the rights of princes, and erred in determining the doctrines of faith and morals." ‡) If this is an error, the truth is probably this: "The Roman popes and the general conciliar authorities have never exceeded the limits of their power, never usurped the rights of princes, and never erred in determining the doctrines of faith and morals." Wonderful! Most wonderful! The Roman popes have never exceeded the limits of their power! Never! Never! Nor Gregory VII, since he called Germany to revolt against Henry IV. Nor Innocent III, since he declared the *magna charta*, of England null and void. Never? Never at all? But wait, a spark of light flashes through our Lutheran brain: probably the power of popes is limitless like that of God. And in this case, of course, they never exceeded the limits of it! For how should they have been able to transgress limits which did not even exist? Yes, that will be it! that will certainly be it! that is

*) Atque silentio praeterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinenten doctrinam contendunt, illis etc. etc.

†) Nro. XXII : Obligatio, qua catholici magistri etc. etc..

‡) Nro. XXIII : Romani pontifices et concilia oecumenica etc. etc..

it quite without a doubt. He can command whatever he wants: spiritual or secular, worship or taxation, obedience or rebellion - he is always in the right, he never goes beyond the limits set for him, and this for no less a reason than because none are set for him. He is the Lord over all. Therefore Pope Boniface VIII was quite right when he declared from the cathedra on November 18, 1302: "To obey the Roman pope is absolutely necessary to the salvation of all human creatures.)

But wait - Pius IX claims even more: Even the general concilia have never exceeded the limits of their power. And here we really get into an ugly fix. For, if we remember rightly, the holy general Concilium of Costnitz decided on April 6, 1415, in its fifth session: "A general Concilium has its power directly from Christ. (Therefore) everyone, of whatever rank or dignity he may be, even the pope, must obey him in all things which concern the faith and the general reformation of the Church of God in head and members." †) Shall now the Concilium obey the Pope, or the Pope the Concilium? Have mercy on us, and tell us so. And if they now curse each other, as Pope Eugene IV. and the holy general assembly of the Church at Basle did? Who is to be followed in such cases? Who is right? Both, answers Pope Pius IX. For neither popes nor general conciliar have ever exceeded the limits of their power. Wonderful multiplication tables. At any rate, different from ours. For if the authorities and subjects each pretended sovereignty for themselves and fought each other on the basis of this, then according to the previous logic one party or both were wrong. Not according to the new papal logic. According to it, the most incompatible things are compatible. According to it, no pope, nor any general council, has ever exceeded the limits of his authority; neither the Costnitz Council nor Pope Boniface VIII, although the one places supreme authority in the pope alone, the other in the general council alone.

After this logical test, it should be superfluous to subject the rest of the new papal pronouncements on power to criticism. For if *Pio nono* says: No pope has ever usurped the rights of princes, and we come to him with Gregory VII or with John XXII, he will simply reply: Precisely because no pope has ever usurped the rights of princes, therefore also not

---

*) *Porro subesse Romano pontifici, omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus et pronuntiamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis. Bull: Unam sanctam in C. J. Can. Extrav. comm. lib. I. tit. 8. c. 1.*

†) *Et primo declarat, quod ipsa in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata, generale concilium faciens et ecclesiam catholicam militantem repraesentans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet, cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis, exsistat, obedire tenetur in his, quae pertinent ad fidem et exstirpationem dicti schismatis ac generalem reformationem ecclesiae Dei in capite et in membris. V. d. Hardt, II. 98.*

For the logic of the past regarded experience as the foundation, and the general proposition as the roof; Pope Pius IX, on the contrary, builds the other way around: first the roof, and then the foundation walls. First, certain general propositions favorable to the pope are established, and then world history is modeled after them.

So then, with the same impartiality, one might say cheerfulness, it is asserted: the Roman popes have never erred in fixing the doctrines of faith and morals. Is there a reason for this? Perhaps in the Bible! At least Ballerini refers to the word of our Saviour to Peter: "I have prayed for you that your faith may not cease. And to this: Feed my lambs. But does the feeding of lambs, or abiding faith, really involve infallibility? And if so, where is the bridge that leads from *Pio nono* to Peter? For set even Peter had been bishop at Rome, was he not likewise at Antioch? *) Do not the episcopal registers of the Vatican Library count St. Peter as the first bishop of Antioch, St. Evodius as the second, and Ignatius as the third? †) And does it follow, in fact, that all the Antiochian bishops were infallible? Also Paul of Samosata, who had low and altogether unworthy notions of Christ, as if he had been a common man by nature? ‡) Paul of Samosata, against whom the bishops of the other churches gathered as against a desolator of Christ's host? **) There in the Antiochian Synod, in the face of his cathedral, he was found guilty of heresy by all, and thereupon was expelled from the whole general church. ††) Uud he was yet, even according to the Roman registers, a successor of Peter. ‡‡) So it seems after all,

---

*) *Ἰχνατιοζ τηζ χα^ 'Αντιόχειαν Πέτρον διαδοχηζ δεντεροζ την επισκοπήν κεκληρωμενοζ.* Eusebius h. c. Ill, 36.

†) ***1. S. Peter. 2. S. Evodius. 3. S. Ignatius. 4. heros. 5. Cornelius. 6. Eros. 7. Theophilus. 8. Maximinus. 9. Serapio. Codex Bibliothecae Vaticanae Urbinas, 832. fol. 505 sq., Catalogus Patriarcharum Sedis Antiochenae ex Chaldaico in Latinum conversus .***

‡) *Τοντον δι ταπεινα και χαμαιπετη περί τον Χρίστον παρα την Εκκλησιαστικήν διδασκαλίαν φρονηδαντοζ, <δζ κοινον την φνδιν άνθρωπον γενομενον.* Eusebius h. c. VH, 27.

**) *Οι δε λοιποί ταον εκκλησιών ποιμενεζ αλλοθεν ωζ επι λνμεωνα τηζ Χριδτον ποιμνηζ δννηεδαν, οι παντεζ έπι την 'Αντιόχειαν όπενδοντεζ.* Eusebius h. c. VH, 27.

††) *KaS' δν τελενταιαζ δνχκροτη^ειδηζ δννοδον ιΐλειδτων οδών ειΐόκοπων, φοορα^ιειζ και προζ άπαντων ηδη δαφωζ καταννωσώειζ έτεροδοξιαν ό τηζ κατα Αντιόχειαν αίρεδεοαζ αρχή ροζ, τηζ νπο τον ονρανον κα^ολικηζ ίκκληδιαζ αποκηρνττεται.* Eusebius h. c. VII, 29.

‡‡) And indeed the fifteenth. The Vatican Directory gives him the 16th place, St. Peter included. Peter included.

as if infallibility had not been inherited in a straight line. For if one successor of Peter did not receive it by inheritance, no one can know whether the other received it. Or is there an unnameable something that clings to the stones of the streets of Rome, which the Antiochians lack? Perhaps. But was there no Paul of Samosata among the Roman bishops? None who denied the faith? Not one who fell into error? Not even Liberius?

It was around 357 that Pope Liberius wrote to the leaders of the Arian heresy: "I am not in favor of Athanasius. However, because my predecessor, Bishop Julius, had taken care of him, I was afraid that I would be accused of a breach of duty (if I acted otherwise). But when I realized that you had justly condemned him, I immediately gave my consent to your decisions. I also gladly accepted the formula of faith which was discussed, developed, and unanimously established at Sirmium by several of our brethren and colleagues; nor did I contradict it in a single point, but rather made it mine. I follow it, I hold it fast. "*) First, then, Pope Liberius, with Athanasius and the Fathers of Nicaea, had confessed the true deity of Christ, but then he apostatized, excluded St. Athanasius from the communion of the Church, and signed the heretical Formula of Faith of Sirmium. The proceedings of Pope Vigilius speak even louder. For on April 11, 548, he issued to Bishop Mennas of Constantinople a bull, called *Judicatum,* in which he condemned Theodore of Mopsueste and Theodoret, two teachers whose orthodoxy had been recognized by the fourth general assembly of the Church. "Thus we condemn," he writes, "Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, with all his ungodly writings, together with all who defend him. We also condemn the writings of Theodoret, which are written against the right faith and against the 12 chapters of St. Cyril."†) Five years after, May 14, 553, took

*) *Ego Athanasium non defendo, sed quia susceperat illum bonae memoriae Julius episcopus decessor meus, verebar ne ab aliquo praevaricator judicarer. At ubi agnovi, quando Deo placuit, juste vos illum condemnasse, mox consensum commodavi sententiis vestris, literasque super nomine ejus per fratrem nostrum Fortunatianum dedi perferendas ad imperatorem Constantium. Itaque amoto Athanasio a communione omnium nostrum, cujus nec epistolia a me suscipienda sunt. . . Nam ut verius sciatis, me vera flde per hanc epistolam ea loqui, dominus et frater meus communis Demophilus, qui dignatus est pro sua benevolentia fidem vestram et catholicam exponere, quae Sirmio a pluribus fratribus et coepiscopis nostris tractata, exposita et suscepta est ab omnibus, qui in praesenti fuerunt, hanc ego libenti animo suscepi, in nullo contradixi, consensum accommodavi; hanc sequor, haec a me tenetur. Pontificum Romanorum epistolae ed. Constant and Schoenemann. Gottingae 1796 . 8vo. Pag. 286 . 287.*

†) *Et quoniam his verbis, quae nobis de nomine Theodori Mopsuesteni scripta porrecta sunt, multa contraria rectae fidei releguntur-, ideoque anathematizamus Theodorum, qui fuit Mopsuestiae episcopus, cum omnibus suis impiis scriptis et qni vindicant eum . . anathematizamus et scripta Theodoreti, quae contra rectam fidem et duodecim capitula sancti' Cyrilli scripta sunt. Mansi Conciliorum amplissima collectio. Florentiae 1759, folio. IX, 181. 182.*

he publicly retracted in his bull *Constitutum* what he had said against Theodore and against Theodoret.*) Around 554, however, he changed his mind for the second time, annulled what he had said in favor of the two Greeks, and declared Theodore of Mopsuestia once again to be godless,†)

And Honorius? Did not Pope Honorius teach monotheletically in an official letter to the Patriarch Sergius? Did he not reject the scriptural doctrine of two wills in Christ? "We confess," he writes, "one will of our Lord JEsu Christ, because, after all, the Godhead has evidently taken to itself only our nature, not our sin. ‡) And when it is written: I am not come to do my will, but the will of him that sent me, the Father; and: Not as I will, but as thou wilt Father: - these are not testimonies of a twofold will, but words spoken out of accommodation (i.e., accommodation) for the sake of assumed humanity. Christ thus speaks for us, to give us an example that we may follow in his footsteps." **Thus taught Pope Honorius; but the Word of God teaches that Christ had two wills, the divine and the human, the latter of which was always subject to the former and followed it. For the human will prays, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and the divine will cries, "Lazare come forth. For this reason the whole Christian Church rose up against Pope Honorius and condemned him together with his comrades. After the sixth ecumenical (general) council had its letter to Sergius read, it pronounced this verdict in its thirteenth session: "After reading the dogmatic letters of Patriarch Sergius to Cyrus of Phasis and to Pope Honorius, as well as the letter of the latter to Sergius, we found that these documents contradict the apostolic dogmas, also the declarations of the holy councils and all respected fathers, and follow the false teachings of the heretics. Therefore we reject them completely and abhor them as corrupting to the soul. But also the names of these men . . must be cast out of the holy church of God, namely, of Sergius, who brought this ungodly error to the fore, of Cyrus . . and of Theodore of Pharan... . We occupy all of them with the

*) Mansi IX. 93. ff.

†) Praedicta igitur tria impia capitula anathematizamus atque damnamus, id est. . . et impium Theodorum Mopsuestenum cum nefandis ejus conscriptis et quae impie Theodoritus conscripsit. Mansi IX. 487. 488.

‡) Unde etiam unam confitemur voluntatem domini nostri Jesu Christi, quoniam aperte a divinitate assumta fuit nostra natura, non peccatum. Mansi xi. 866.

**) Etsi enim scriptum est: Non veni facere voluntatem meam, sed ejus, qui misit me, patris; et: Non sicut ego

Curse. But besides these, it is our common resolution that the former pope Honorius shall also be expelled from the church and condemned, because we found in his letter to Sergius that he followed the latter's view in everything and confirmed his ungodly dogmas with his authority." *) At the close of the same session the second letter of Honorius was also communicated, and the Synod decreed that both papal letters should be immediately burned as corrupting to the soul. And Pope Leo II. confirmed this condemnation. "We curse," he wrote to the Emperor, "the inventors of the new error. . . Also Honorius, who has not glorified this apostolic Church by the doctrine of apostolic tradition, but has dared to undermine the immaculate faith by unholy treason." †) So judged Pope Leo; so Pope Gregory II, so his successors Gregory III, Zacharias, Stephen II, Stephen III-, Paul I, Constantine II, Philip, Stephen IV, Hadrian I, Leo III, Stephen V, Paschalis I, Eugene II, Valentinus, Gregory IV, Sergius II, Leo IV, Benedict III, Nicolaus I, Hadrian II. None of these twenty-one popes took office without cursing Pope Honorius, together with his comrades, by name and expressly. ‡)

---

*) *Άνακριν αντ ε$ ταζ ώζ* arto *Σέργιου του γενομενου τάχ,τριαρχου ταυτηζ της . . . ιίολεωζ γραφειδαζ δογματικά^ έιΐιδτολαζ rtpoS τε Κυρον τον τηνικαυτα γενομενον irti^ycortov του Φαδιδοζ και Όνωριον τον γενομενον rtartav της πρεδβυτεραζ Ύωμη$, ώζαυτωζ δε και την* art *δκεινου, τουτεδτιν Όνωριου προζ αυτόν Σέργιον άντιγ ραφειδαν ετίι- δτολην και ταυταϊ εύρηκοτεζ Λαντη άλλοτριαζ τυγχανουδαζ των* arto- *δτολικων διδαγμάτων και των όριδνεντων* arto *των άγιων δυνοδων και πάντων των εκκριτων πάτερων, έπομεναζ δε ταιζ των αιρε τικών -ψευδοδιδαδκαλιαιζ, ταυταζ παντη αποβαλλόμενα και ώζ ψυχο- φνορουζ βδελυττομε^α- ών δε τουτεδτι των αύτων τα άδεβη άπο- δτρεφομενα δόγματα, τούτων και τα ονοματα* be *της άγιαζ του νέου έκκληδιαζ έκβληνηναι ίκριναμεν, τουτεδτι Σέργιου . . . του άριαμενού περί του τοιουτου άδεβουζ δυγγραφεδναι δογματοζ, Κυρου . . ., είτα δε και Θεόδωρου του της Φαραν γενομενου Ιπιδκοπου . .., ουϊ και άνα- νεματι πανυποβληνηναι δριζομεν προζ τουτοιζ δε δυνεκβλη- Vp ν αι εκ της ά γ ι αζ του νέου έκκληδιαζ και δυν αν α- V ε μ ατ ιδ V ην αι δυν ειδ ο μ εν και* Or *ω ρι ον, τον γενομενον παπαν της πρεδβυτεραζ Ρω μη ζ δια το εύρηκεναι ήμαζ δια των 'γενομενων παρ' αύτου γραμμάτων προζ Σέργιον κατα παντα τη εκείνου γνώμη έξακολουνηδαντα, και τα αύτου άδεβη κυρωδαντα δογματα.* Mansi xi. 553. 556.

†) Anathematizamus novi erroris inventores . . . nec non et Honorium, qui hanc aposto- licam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est. Mansi xi. 731. (733.).

‡) Auctores vero novi haeretici dogmatis Sergium, Pyrrhum . . . una cum Honorio, qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit . . . condemnatione percellimus anathematis, such was their declaration. Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum ed. Gamerius. Parisiis 1680. 4to. Pag. 43. vergi. Page 33 note u. page 41 note.

Nor did the great Coneilies tire of repeating the condemnation of Honorius. Thus the Trullanic Synod of 692, thus the so-called second Conciliar of Nicaea, thus the Constantinopolttanic of 869 the eighth ecumenical (general). How now? Did Pope Honorius err? He didn't? Well, so did the 22 popes after him who condemned him as a heretic. Either Pope Honorius or Pope Leo II; there is absolutely no escape from this. In fact, in the face of this dilemma, the defenders of papal infallibility have no other choice but to cancel their sails; they would then have to prefer, with David Strauss, to declare all acts to be suppressed which do not fit into their frame. One may really be curious to see how the forthcoming Roman Concilium will deal with this question. Perhaps it will turn at some time to the firm of Strauss, Volkmar & Compagnie for a devastating historical-critical brochure on the letters of Leo II, the acts of the sixth, seventh and eighth General Councils, the *liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* published by the Jesuit Garnerius and some other pieces of documents. For the internal reasons are really all against it. Just as against the authenticity of the New Testament writings. For if the four Gospels were authentic, there would be a living God; and if the acts of the sixth ecumenical assembly are authentic, the pope is not infallible. And neither of these can be readily admitted.

And how is it then with the good Pope Zacharias? Did he not decree under the first of July 744 that the baptism performed by an ignorant priest in Bavaria "in *nomine patria et filia et spiritu sancta*", *) "in the name of fatherland and daughter and the holy spirit" was valid?*) Fortunately, he was honest enough to publicly retract this whimsical decree three years later and to confess that the invocation of the Holy Trinity, as prescribed by God's Word, was, however, required for a valid baptism. †) Of this, of course, the good pope was not so easily convinced, that there were counterfoots, people just among us, and there one also saw other stars. ‡) Therefore he excommunicated Vigilius, who had asserted this, and ordered him to be deprived of his priestly dignity, because his doctrine was a false one, which contended against the Lord and his soul. **)

*) Retulerunt nuntii tui, quod fuerit in eadem provincia sacerdos, qui latinam linguam penitus ignorabat et, dum baptizaret, nesciens latini eloquii, infringens linguam diceret: baptizo te in nomine patria et filia et spiritu sancta. Ac per hoc tua r. fraternitas consideravit eos rebaptizari. Sed s. frater, si ille, qui baptizavit, non errorem introducens aut haeresin, sed pro sola ignorantia Romanae locutionis infringendo linguam baptizans dixisset, non possumus consentire, ut denuo baptizentur. C. J. Can. Decreti, Pars III, Dist. IV, c. 86.

†) Si lotus in fonte baptismatis quis fuerit sine invocatione trinitatis, perfectus Christianus non est, nisi in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti fuerit baptizatus etc. C. J. Can. Decreti, pars III. dist. iv. c. 83. mansi xii. 339. jaffe 187.

‡) Quod alius mundus et alii homines sub terras sint. Mansi XII. 339. Jaffe 187.

**) Mansi XII. 339. Jaffe 187.

There is also much to tell about the contradictions of the popes among themselves. Thus Pope Gelasius wrote to the bishops Majoricus and John around 494: "We have learned that certain persons partake only of the holy body of Christ, but abstain from the chalice with the holy blood. These people should ... receive the Sacraments either completely or not at all, because the certification of one and the same mystery cannot be done without great wickedness." *) Pope Pius IV, on the other hand, with his Tridentines, declared that even under the bread alone the whole Christ is received, †) Yes, he curses those who teach that all Christians, according to God's will, should receive the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist under both forms. ‡) Further, Pope Gregory III teaches.., if a wife loses the ability to fulfill her conjugal duty, her husband may dismiss her and marry another.**) But Pope Nicolaus is decidedly against this,††) And did not the same Pope Nicolaus maintain that baptism in the name of JESUS was as valid as that in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit and Pope Pelagius that this was not true?***) We might still recall Pope John XXII, who taught about 1331 that the souls of the saints did not behold God face to face immediately after their departure,†††) and the

---

*) Comperimus autem, quod quidam, sumta tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacrati cruoris abstineant; qui procul dubio, quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur adstringi, aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia divisio unius eiusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire. C. J. Can. Decreti, Pars III, Dist. II, c. 12.

†) Insuper declarat, quamvis redemtor noster, ut antea dictum est, in suprema illa coena hoc sacramentum in duabus speciebus instituerit et apostolis tradiderit; tamen fatendum esse, etiam sub altera tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum verumque sacramentum sumi, ac propterea, quod ad fructum attinet, nulla gratia necessaria ad salutem eos defraudari, qui unam speciem solam accipiunt. Cone. Trid. Sess. XXI. cap. 3.

‡) Si quis dixerit, ex Dei praecepto vel necessitate salutis omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi eucharistiae sacramenti sumere debere, anathema sit. Cone. Trid. Sess. XXI Can. 1.

**) Quod proposuisti, si mulier infirmitate correpta non valuerit viro debitum reddere, quid ejus faciat conjugalis ? Bonum esset, si sic permaneret, ut abstinentiae vacaret. Sed quia hoc magnorum est; ille, qui

Benedict XII after the proceedings of the University of Paris contradicted.*) Or to Pope Sixtus V and his famous Vulgate. As is well known, the Tridentine Council had decreed that Jerome's Latin translation of the Church was to be considered authentic, and that no one should dare to reject its authority. Naturally the question arose: which text? for there were six dozen different texts with considerable variations, and none of them was without considerable error. Then Pope Sixtus V felt called upon to remedy the crying distress, and in 1589 published his Latin Bible with the declaration that he had himself improved the printing errors in it. †) Whoever henceforth would dare to change even one jot or tittle of the text thus ascertained by him would be liable to the penalty of the great ban! ‡) Did any one dare? Yes, and a pope at that! None other than His Holiness' immediate successor, Pope Clement VIII. This - how shall we say - man had the forehead to have not merely one little dot, but 1207, write one thousand two hundred and seven partly quite considerable passages changed in it.**) Now we do not want to deny by any means that most of these 1207 changes were real improvements. Thus Pope Sixtus V. had omitted Proverbs 25, 24, Matth. 27, 35, and seven other passages; Acts 24, 18, and eleven other verses he had provided with considerable additions; nineteen times he had erred in the numbers, Ex. 32, 28, for example, by the small amount of 30,000; not to mention lesser oversights, which count in the hundreds. But it is always a strong thing when any one dares to act contrary to a clear and express decree of the Holy Roman See. Especially when this person is not a Lutheran heretic, but a Pope himself. Now we really do not know whether Pope Sixtus V or Pope Clement VIII erred: the one by forbidding to improve a Vulgate with 1207 errors, or the other by improving the 1207 errors in defiance of this prohibition. According to the logic of the Syllabus, probably neither. For according to it, it seems, papal contradictions are not contradictions simply because they are papal. But if a pope errs, the error he commits becomes truth precisely because a pope commits it. And

*) Denzinger Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum. Wirceburgi 1856. 8vo. 182. 183.

**) The Englishman Jarnes has had all 1207 changes printed completely on 54 quarto pages in his famous, now rather rare Bellum papale, Londini 1600.

if then a second pope comes and improves on the first, the situation is immediately reversed, and with some speed.

But even more tangibly than by such contradictions, God has proved the palpability of the popes by those judgments which he imposed on his church in the two centuries before the Reformation. Two popes at the same time, sometimes even three, that was an audible answer to the mad arrogance of Pope Boniface VIII, that obeying the Roman pope was necessary for everyone's salvation. Who then was the infallible head of the contending church and the governor of Christ: Pope Urban VI or Pope Clement VII? Pope Gregory XII. or Pope Benedict XIII.? They were all regularly elected, and therefore without question infallible. But what was to be done when they differed in opinion, which happened several times? Truly, a problem of no small difficulty. And how did the Catholic Church of the fifteenth century solve it? She did away with them both by decree *de dato* Pisa, July 5, 1409. Pope John XXIII was dealt with even more summarily at Costnitz. When he refused to abdicate, he was arrested by the Burgrave of Hohenzollern and put on trial.

But not even in the pretension (assertion) of infallibility were the Roman bishops constant. For from the beginning until deep into the sixteenth century there were popes who asserted the possibility of error not only from their ancestors, but from themselves. Thus Pope Pelagius II. *) so Innocent III-, otherwise truly not the most auspruchloscste among his comrades. "All my other sins," he says, "no one but God judges, but if I commit sins against the faith, the Church can judge me."†) Similarly Pope Clement VI and Pope Urban V. ‡) And Pope Gregory XI. even assembled on the 5th of May, 1374, in his palace at Rome. May 1374 in his palace at Avignon, three notaries, a cardinal, an archbishop, four bishops, and two lower clergymen, and declared the following on record: "Sane and in my right mind as I am, I have written my last solemn testament in full possession of my power of judgment, and compose it as follows: ----------Where I am in the Consistory or in consultations, or in sermons, or in public and private conversation, by an accident of the tongue, or in some other way, for instance, from confusion, or from disorderly pleasure, or perhaps present power-

*) Cur mutatio sententiae huic sedi in crimine objicitur, quae a cuncta ecclesia humiliter in eius auctore veneratur. Launoii Opera V, 1. 260.

†) In tantum mihi fides necessaria est, ut, quum de ceteris peccatis solum Deum judicem habeam, propter solum peccatum, quod in fidem committitur, possem ab ecclesia judicari. Launoii Opera V, 1. 41.

‡) Natalis Alexander Historia Ecclesiastica ed. Mansi. Bingii 1790. 4to.. XVIII. 387.

I have said anything erroneous to please heretics, or through lack of self-control and attention, or out of loquacity, which is contrary to the Catholic faith, the faith which I profess publicly before God and men, as is my duty before others, and which I cultivate and wish to cultivate; whether I have knowingly applauded heretical opinions, which I do not believe, or unknowingly, or whether I have turned my favor to adversaries of the Catholic religion; - all this I hereby solemnly recant, pronounce my abhorrence of it, and wish it to be regarded as not having been said."*) Will such a testament also flow from the lips of Pope Pius the 9th before he dies?

And Hadrian VI declared, "If by the Roman Church be understood her head, that is, the pope, it is certain that he can err, even in the faith; (even) so as to confirm heresy by his decision or bull. For indeed there have been several Roman popes who have led heretical teaching." †) And Pope Paul IV, as late as about 1557, confessed before an assembled Consistory, "I doubt not that my predecessors could have erred as well as I; not only in the: present, but in other pieces also." ‡) If, then, Pope Paul IV, together with his predecessors, could err, with what pope do you suppose infallibility begins? With Alexander VII, of whom the Florentine envoy reported that no true word came from his mouth? Or with His Holiness Count Mastai Ferretti?

It seems: with His Holiness Count Mastai Ferretti. **For the Roman Council, which he intends to open on December 8, 1869, is to elevate his, that is the Pope's, infallibility to dogma.

Or will the gentlemen of the Church Assembly be so kind as to extend the privilege of infallibility to all his predecessors as well? In any case, it would be original.

*,) Nos sani et bene compositi mentis nostrae ... in pleno nostrae rationis iudicio testa- mentnm nostrum ultimum nuncupativum in scriptis fecimus et facimus in hunc modum: Item volumus, dicimus et protestamur ex nostra certa scientia, quod si in consistorio aut in consiliis vel sermonibus vel collationibus publicis vel privatis, ex lapsu linguae aut alias ex aliqua turbatione vel etiam laetitia inordinata, aut praesentia magnatum ad eorum forsitan complacentiam, seu ex aliquali distemperantia vel inadvertentia aut superfluitate, aliqua dixerimus erronea contra catholicam fidem, quam coram Deo et hominibus publice, ut tenemur prae ceteris, profitemur, colimus et colere cupimus; seu forsitan adhaerendo aliquorum opinionibus contrariis fidei catholicae scienter, quod non credimus, vel etiam ignoranter, aut dando favorem aliquibus contra catholicam religionem obloquentibus; - illa expresse et specialiter revocamus, detestamur et habere volumus pro non dictis. D'Achery Spicilegium ed. De la Barre. Paris 1723. fol. 111, 737,738.

†) Launoii Opera V, 1. 43.

t) Non dubito, quin ego et decessores mei errare aliquando potuerimus, etc. etc. Launoii Opera V, 1. 264.

The fifth point.

The "*Lutheran and Missionary*," the organ of the "*General Council,*" in its issue of June 24 of this year, contains an editorial on the above words. "The fifth point!" Truly, a mysterious expression, incomprehensible to all those who are not acquainted with the interesting "Letters from New York" of Insulanus-Krotel. To the latter belongs the merit of having invented this appropriate name, for he is, to our knowledge, the first who wrote of a "fifth point." For it is said in one of his "Letters from New York" to the "*Lutheran and Missionary of* March 25 of this year, as follows:

> "If we wait for agreement on every point, we may wait till doomsday, for as soon as agreement is reached on four points, the fifth will be at hand, like the usury question, which is now carried on in some quarters; and when that has been dispatched, number six will come forth, like Banquo's ghost, and so it will go on."

Similar to this, the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" now speaks out in an editorial about the "fifth point" (the usury question). With the skill peculiar to them, one of the four doctors of divinity (*nomen nescitur*), whose names are at the head of the paper, now also takes up the "fifth point" and - refutes the point of view of the Missouri professors? - o no, that is not necessary at all, it would be in bad taste if one wanted to say much more about this point of view that has long since been overcome - no, "without getting into the argument," the Herr Doctor only makes a little fun of this new "fifth point" and lets a few aesthetic jokes fly. He introduces his witty article as follows:

> "During the last two years our readers have heard and read much of the well-known 'four points,' namely, Closed Communion, Pulpit Exchange, Secret Societies, and Chiliasm, but perhaps few of the same have heard or read much of what may be called the 'fifth point,' which has attracted quite a bit of attention in the Missouri Synod, and also in some other quarters, and which may become of greater importance than was at first thought. Without entering into the controversy, we think it our duty, as faithful reporters on ecclesiastical matters, especially those in our own church, to give our readers a brief statement of the state of affairs."

After the "ecclesiastical reporter" had hereupon published several of the theses of Prof. Walther on usury, published in "Lehre und Wehre" (Nov. and Dec. 1866), and in addition some of those in Past. S. K. Brobst's

"Theologische Monatshefte" published by Prof. Gottf. Fritschel's antitheses published in the "Theologische Monatsfte" in order to "give a brief account of the state of affairs to refined readers," he reports that the "Lutheraner" of June 1, 1869, contained an "Eingesandt" under the title: "Ist das Gebot vom Wucher ein speciell jüdisches Gesetz, wie Prof. Fritschel thinks, or does it belong to the moral law which is binding on all men"; to which the editors had remarked: "Although the editors had intended to remain silent about usury now until the meeting of the general synod, since more and more opponents of Luther's doctrine of usury are now appearing, the cause of truth demands that the 'Lutheraner' should not remain silent and stick to its motto: 'God's word and Luther's teaching pass away now and nevermore'."

So far the venerable Doctor has remained quite faithful to his intention "to give a brief account of the state of affairs as an ecclesiastical reporter, without entering into the controversy," but something else must have occurred to the dear man while he was writing, for he does not conclude his "account" here, but attaches an amusing medical treatise to it; the theological "reporter" now makes room for the medical buffoon. But let it not be forgotten that the honored Doctor did not want to "enter into the controversy"; he did not even want to give reasons against this absurd "fifth point" of the Missourians; he only wanted to give his readers "a brief account of the state of affairs," and in accordance with his intention - he ridicules and mocks this "fifth point," without having explained his right to do so by giving reasons. This seems to the great man quite unnecessary; it is enough for him that the "fifth point" is a "point" at all; he already has more than too much in the "four points," which is surprising that he therefore considers himself entitled to scorn and pityingly ridicule every "fifth point," whether proved or not.

But hear and appreciate the venerable Doctor's bubbling wit; he writes:

> "It is highly probable, therefore, that many a line will be written upon this interesting point, and that it will form one of the principal objects of deliberation at the next session of the Missouri Synod. As that body has long since finished with the all-known "four points," and was not satisfied until other Synods had also tried their chewing and digesting powers upon the same, it is quite proper that they should now make the attempt with a new or fifth point, so that , so that, as soon as she has thoroughly chewed it (which, with her well-known skill in handling strong food, will not be difficult for her to do, provided she is given sufficient time to do so and her teeth can stand it), she can present it to the weaker synods, who will not be expected to

may be allowed to undertake such a work until their stronger brethren of Missouri have shown them how it must be done. We know that some of our Missourian friends very decidedly and openly draw the "*General Council*" *of* not wanting to go to the four points (or 'bite,' as one poetically put it), but, unless we are very much mistaken, there are some, even in Missouri, who are inclined to turn away from this new food, as a little too strong even for them. But it does much to have confidence in your cook and your doctor. If the dose handed us by the latter, however disgusting, we still submit and obey; and if we know the cook, we eat without fearing that unfre meal will end in a corpse visitation.

Our Missourian brethren have unlimited confidence in the doctors and cooks of St. Louis, and if it were not for the signs of rebellion which have already appeared, we believe they would all very soon pronounce the dose very good, and require us to take the same also, to prove our orthodoxy. However, since there are indications that it will take them quite a long time to choke it down, we congratulate ourselves on a short rest period during which we will try to digest the four points already administered. We are determined to keep calm (to tick it eool^). We know that this is a world of testing and struggle. We prepare for the fifth point in the complete certainty that a sixth, a seventh, an eighth and so on will follow until death will put an end to our lives. Meanwhile, let us wait and see how it will be, for this is a *matter in* which they and we do not *feel free to take the* greatest interest."

So much for the venerable doctor of theology. Is it not a pity that such a man has not also received the medical doctor's hat? What deep insight into the secrets of physiology, diagnostics and dietetics does not this equally poetic and aesthetic comparison of the chewing and digesting abilities of the Missouri Synod reveal. How delicate and fine is also the cute scene how Missouri first chews the fifth point and then hands it to her sister synod to do the same with it!

The poor "Missourian brethren!" They have, says the venerable Doctor, such unlimited confidence in their St. Louis cooks and doctors, that they would therefore choke down even so disgusting a dose as the fifth point of the usury question! - However, would that be

If the "Missourian brethren" were to accept the fifth point, they would be justly deplored. (But does not the Doctor perhaps know that the "Missourian brethren" have a conscience in their bodies which compels them to agree with the word of God and to submit to his ordinances, even if these seem to be "disgusting doses"?) But the Doctor does not want to "enter into the controversy," and therefore brings no proofs; he is, after all, a "faithful reporter," and as such he errs only once. But to err is human; is it not?

But the Doctor is decidedly right when he says that the Missourians have great confidence in their professors in St. Louis; and indeed they are right to do so. For hitherto these "doctors and cooks" (as the Doctor likes to express himself) have always presented to them the dear word of God as a wholesome, though often bitter, remedy for all the diseases of the sin-sick flesh, and as sensible, noisome milk, or strong food, as wholesome, strong home-cooked food, for the preservation and strengthening of life out of God. Far be it from me to assert that these "doctors and cooks" did not here and there inadvertently slip up a little, but this much we know for certain, that they never mixed soul-destroying poison into medicines or food, so that we need not be concerned that "a coroner's inquest will result from our meal.

But how about the "doctors and cooks" of the "*General Council*" in Philadelphia, New York, or Pittsburg? These gentlemen probably do not enjoy too much confidence on the part of their patients and boarders, or perhaps too little? - Yet we do not know, but this much we do know, to be sure, that some of these gentlemen cooks, in baking bread, have at times put quite a bit of leaven into the dough, if not exactly of the "leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducæans," yet of that of the chiliasts and other gushers. In view of this circumstance it would at least be desirable that the patients and boarders of the "*General Council" should* keep a close watch on their "doctors and cooks," for "a little leaven sours the whole dough.

Well, the venerable Doctor does not take it amiss that we, too, "without getting into the fray, as faithful reporters on ecclesiastical matters, have given a brief account of the state of affairs" to the poor "Missourian brethren," and in conclusion he allows us to wish him a quite pleasant rest "for the period of rest for the digestion of the four points already administered," so that the digestion may go more easily and more quickly from places and the stomach of the dear man may not suffer any damage.

One who's boarding at Missouri.

Miscellencies.

Rationalism and Romanism. The rationalists also claimed that they taught that man is saved through Christ. By the word "Christ," however, they understood their own fulfillment of the law, established according to the precepts of Christ, and made possible to them by the encouraging process of Christ; in short, their holy or Christian love in faith, since they also knew how to speak of a faith. This rationalism was entirely papistic; the difference between a good rationalist and a good monk was only one of degree, but to the advantage of the monk. Mähler is so naive as to admit this in part, saying (Preface p. XIII): "Catholic dogma is as much related to the one (rationalism) as to the other (orthodox Protestantism), and the Catholic can therefore comprehend both, because his system is the unity of both." This latter we call Semipelagianism. (Pistorius.)

(Sent by A. W.)

"Poem by H. M. J. Huttenlocher." (May issue of "Lehre und Wehre.") This poem appeared in 1864 (i.e., 12 years after Löhe's publication) in a special issue, and was not "reworked," as the "predecessors" had done, but reproduced in the "forms of the original," only "critically recensed according to philological principles, . . as if one had had an old classic before him," and provided with 187 explanatory "notes" by Dr. J. C. M. Laurent in Neuendettelsau. Title: "Johann Valentin Andreä: The Good Life of a Righteous Servant of God." So Rudelbach also cites it with very commendatory recommendation in "Christian Biography" pp. 312 and 447.*) Sender obtained it from Siemon at Fort Wayne for, as he believes, 30 Cts.

*) Neither L. nor R. mention the name Huttenlocher. The latter says: It is "a shining, by its content as well as by its form unsurpassable example of such a presentation", which namely "presents the burden, the consolation and the glory of the ministry... with unsurpassable truth and intimacy. It should indeed be the manual of all evangelical preachers." Further: "Our fathers put ... with Joh. Val. Andreä, in his excellent Preacher's Mirror, it is clear to all preachers of the Word and stewards of God's mysteries that only he who is willing to believe, to know, to do, to suffer, to leave, to fear, to possess what no one else likes or wants, is worthy to till God's field, to build His house." He calls Andreä a "great teacher, whose monument still has no place in Germany, while a thousand other memorial stones rise in the graveyards (his grave is washed out by the rain, while his mighty, flashing word" - not only in this poem - "only now and then finds a heart open)."

"Church of the Future or Future of the Church. By Max Frommel, Lutheran pastor in Jspringen near Pforzheim. Hanover by Carl Meyer. 1869." Under this title the excellent Pious! speaks out on Union and Separation in his equally captivating and striking manner. The following paragraph is a sample of the valuable booklet:

"The scriptural confession of the truth is our only power against Rome.

It is a widespread saying that in order to be able to fight successfully against Rome and its growing power, the Protestants must unite, and that this is the purpose of the union between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, which, however, is prevented by the rigid adherence to the Confession.

We certainly do not underestimate the serious necessity of standing together against Rome in view of the threatening future. Many smile carelessly, since the Pope is losing one piece after another of his Papal States, and now Spain, his last dark castle, has also fallen. But they forget that the ecclesiastical power of the German bishops has been greater since the loss of their secular rule in Germany than since the days of the Reformation. In *General Council there* sits on the chair of Peter a pope so genuinely Roman as scarcely since Innocent III. No allocution in which he does not compare himself with Christ, no manifesto in which he does not, as in the Syllabus, Encyclica, and Invitation to the Ecumenical Concil, lay down and renew all claims to infallibility and to the office of judge over the whole world. Add to this the progress of Romanism in America and England, in whose capital the Roman Archbishop Manning was permitted to say: 'Protestantism belongs to the past.' He might be replied: What audacity to assert that in the face of English Protestantism! But the assertion nevertheless remains correct. As a political power, as antipathy against the Catholic Church, Protestantism still exists, of course, but not as a definable confession in which the masses agree. That belongs to the past.

But not only this characterizes the state of affairs, but also the fact that Rome has her confederates in the Protestant camp. Is it not of the highest importance that just at the present time the two fundamental principles of the Reformation, namely, justification by faith alone and the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures, are openly questioned among the Protestants? Yes, one may assert, there is hardly a Roman dogma which has not found its representative among well-known Protestant theologians. How far this goes may be shown by Schenkel's example, who, in his indignation at the protest made against him, puts forward in his defence entirely Papist principles: 'the decisions of the competent authorities (here of the Baden Oberkirchenrath,

In other words, if an ecclesiastical authority has spoken *ex cathedra, then it* is infallible truth, to which all lay people must submit. How contemptuously the same professor thinks of his favorite child, the mature congregation, he expresses in an equally papist manner: The first demand, however, if a trial of heretics is to take place, is indisputably that the trial take an orderly course, that unauthorized persons not arrogate to themselves a judgment about persons and things, in which only very few, according to the nature of the matter, can be entitled to a valid judgment. †) Therefore he also calls his venerable brethren in office, for daring to protest against his heresies on the basis of Scripture and the Confessions, virtually "a ruthless mob, which has set itself in the place of ecclesiastical authority." This is such thick Romanism that one cannot be surprised when Schenkel says in another place: "rather a living pope than a paper one," which means in German: rather become Roman than Lutheran!

But even among the representatives of a positive Union there are alarming signs of a misjudgment of the struggle against Rome. Yet the General Superintendent of Berlin, Hoffmann, in his latest writing, sees, as the final firework of his hopes for the Prussian Union, the Catholic bishops of Germany meeting together with the Protestant General Superintendents at the future German National Synod! In a conversation with an eminent leader of the "believing party," it came to the passage ‡) where Paul speaks "of that which holds it up." The dear man interpreted it to mean institutions, such as that of the Roman Church. I replied: our fathers saw in the Roman institution of the Pabstium the Antichrist, and only in the Bright Testimony against the Pabstium that which stops the Antichrist's ruin. It is most interesting to see in the "community" of the Michelhahns, which is widespread in Southern Germany, how Roman doctrines quite naively naturalize themselves among believing Protestants. Their version of justification corresponds exactly to the statement of the *Tridentinum*, their doctrine of Hades to that of purgatory, their tradition rests in Michael Hahn's writings; fasting, celibacy, monastic life are praised as especially good works, and their organization is a hierarchy in miniature.

But also in the Lutheran camp Roman leaven has been spreading for years. The high church direction is without doubt based on the

*) Allg. Kirchl. Zeitschr. 1866. Heft 3. p. 174 f.

†) A. op. cit. p. 171.

‡) 2 Thess. 2, 6.

In the doctrines of justification, of the sacraments, of church, office, and government, such significant deviations have emerged that the ultramontane Dr. Jörg was already able to register them as hopeful buds for a Roman harvest. If someone of his time said in a writing against the Union: "In a time like ours, a piece of Christianity falls if any Roman institute falls," then the individual Roman institutes have also found their individual admirers and defenders among Lutherans.

So the theologians. The Protestant people on the whole, however, are strongly on Roman lines through the prevailing rationalism. It is true that it still has a dark historical memory that the fathers once laid down their goods and blood for the Protestant confession, and that is also the reason for an unconscious, deeply justified aversion to ceremonies and liturgy that could remind one of Rome. For where there is no clear testimony against the Roman doctrine, where there is no clear confession against the papacy, the people feel that every enrichment of the liturgy is a rapprochement with Rome, and they see their last barriers endangered. For in the doctrine itself the Roman errors are most widespread: Instead of justification by faith alone, the general dogma is: He who does right will be justified. Instead of the authority of Holy Scripture, reason is regarded as the supreme judge in matters of faith, and general reason expresses itself in "public opinion." From here, however, it is only one step to the papacy; for public opinion in the church must have or create an official mouth or a legal organ. For now the same is sought everywhere in synods, general synods, national synods. But there is no guarantee that when these, after some use, fail to serve, one will also put up with "the living pope," who has long since declared: "I am nothing but the voice of correct public opinion in the church. The parallel of how, in the political field, one passes from republic to imperialism on the broadest democratic basis par le vote universel is obvious. . . .

In the face of this dangerous situation we say: the confession of the truth is our only victorious weapon against Rome. If we want to be consistent, we must confess that a union between Wittenberg and Geneva is not enough, but that it must logically progress to a union with Rome. There are only two ways of presenting the unity of the church: one is through the constitution, and that is the Roman way; the other is through the confession, and that is the Lutheran way. Since all attempts to bring about unity in the confession between Lutherans and Reformed must be considered a complete failure, the Union itself has given up this way and has switched to seeking and expressing unity in the constitution. All the reasons, however, which point to

The arguments put forward in this way for a union of Protestants among themselves also apply to a union with Rome. Schenkel, the zealous Unionist, expressed this incomparably aptly in Neustadt: "Once the difference in two dogmas, and indeed in two such essential dogmas, has been declared irrelevant and does not justify a separation in ecclesiastical and life communion, one does not see why the difference in the remaining dogmas should still separate and divide. By proclaiming, with reference to two dogmas, that a difference in regard to them was of no essential importance for ecclesiastical communion, the Union Foundation basically proclaimed the same thing with reference to all dogmas." We Lutherans, on the other hand, say: "What separates us from Rome also separates us from Geneva and Zurich, and is exactly the same thing that unites us among ourselves: namely, the full confession of the truth of the Scriptures. To this confession we are bound in conscience by the Word of God, and this binding in conscience makes us free and glad to bear witness and to suffer for such witness. This is perhaps what the Roman Cardinal Wisemann means when he says: in the last battle that Rome will have to fight, only Catholics and Lutherans will face each other. But the conscience, truly free in faith in Christ's merit and truly bound to God's Word, is still the deepest power in the history of the world. When the pope says so proudly, *Non possumus* ("We cannot," namely, yield), we answer him not with a human *Non volumus* ("we will not"), but with the apostolic, ""We can do nothing against the truth, but for truthfulness"" *); or with Luther's old *non possum: ""*Here I stand, I cannot help it, God help me.""

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The "*Lutheran and Visitor*" makes it a great crime for Dr. Conrad of the "***Lutheran Observer" to have*** communicated what "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) quoted verbatim from the "***Lutheran and Visitor" in its*** May issue, p. 158, and to have drawn erroneous conclusions from it about the latter paper. The junior editor of the same goes so far as to accuse Dr. Conrad of deliberate falsification, and at last exclaims, "Must we come to David's conclusion, and say, All men are liars?" We would scarcely have believed that Americans, who otherwise display such great degout before sharp polemics, were capable of such injurious attacks, especially in a case in which the thought was so close to the love of every Christian that there was a misunderstanding here. The words: ***"***The ***majority of the ministry"*** we had translated: "The majority of the ministry";
but the "***Observer***" had translated this back incorrectly: "***The majority of the***

*) 2 Cor. 13, 8.

ministerianis", but how should love not have suspected at once that this was an oversight? Or what need was there to suppose that Dr. Conrad intended forgery? If the fear of God did not prevent him from doing so, should not at least the slightest degree of prudence prevent him? Indeed, the "***Lutheran and Visitor***" did not play an honorable part in the matter. W.

"They that think that godliness is a trade." (1 Tim. 6:5.) - William E. Dodge, Presbyterian of the old school, according to an interchangeable paper, recently gave an exceedingly distressing testimony concerning religious conditions here: "He," says a report, "spoke of the many evils arising from the schism, one of which was, that it had enlarged the Episcopal Church, for which America was not otherwise the proper soil. Young men settling in small towns look out of the barometers of society, and join whichever church exercises the most influence, and thereby find a clue to their business. They find, say, two Presbyterian churches, one of the 'new,' another of the 'old' school, both weak, comparatively poor, and without influence, and join the Episcopalians, who are united and promise better success." It almost seems as if this experience had been a strong motive to some in causing the Presbyterians of the old and new schools to unite of late. W.

Methodism. In a local English newspaper we read: "The Methodists have a gift for doing the Lord's work (!) on business principles and making money out of it in a way that has no equal. They have erected a magnificent building on Broadway in New York for their book business and community purposes, and now they are in the market with half a million dollars of gold coupons, bearing seven per cent interests, which they intend to sell to pay for a part of the building."

Chicago. A Chicago newspaper reports on June 28 and 29 of this year that a completely new religion has just been established in that city, which is called "***scientific religion***" by its inventor, Rev. Balch. According to a report in the paper, the latter preached on the fifth Sunday after Trinity on ***"Money",*** and spoke out

The theological teaching on this subject is that the love of money is the root of all evil. The founders of Christianity were obviously not political economists. Standing in the broad light of the 19th century with its scientific treasures, the inheritance of all ages, I posit the proposition that the love of money is rather the root of all good in the world. Money is the nerve of war, the support of peace, the nurse of science; without it human society cannot exist, and a correct knowledge of the science of money is the true key to lifting most of the evils in the world - poverty, commercial stagnation, vice, ignorance and crime." The paper makes the following remark on this subject: "The man Balch is a mad gross humbug, who knows even less, if it is possible, of science than of religion. But the country at this time is full of just such humbugs."

About the religious position of the Presidents of the United States the "Boston Journal" reports the following: "John Adams was a freethinker after the fashion of the French Revolutionary period. Jefferson was called a freethinker, but his opposition was more to the idea of a state church than to the church at all. He had imbibed through the preaching of a Baptist preacher, named Leland, the idea of a pure church composed only of true believers, and not finding this perfect church, he remained unchurched. Madison attended the Episcopal Church, his wife was a member, but he himself was not. Monroe was a member of the

Episcopal Church, but not a member of Holy Communion. The English churches here have almost all the institution that one may be a contributing, attending, and voting member in elections of preachers, etc., without being admitted to Holy Communion, and without having a right to vote in the election of elders and in spiritual matters. John Quincy Adams was a Unitarian, held a seat in the Presbyterian Church, and served as a trustee of the same, but was not a communion member. Once when a snowstorm on Sunday made the streets almost impassable, he was seen knee deep in snow wading to church, and with six others formed the entire audience of the church, but he never took Holy Communion. Jackson was in the Presbyterian church every Sunday morning as a very earnest and attentive hearer. After the service was over he made a bow to the preacher and walked stately out of the church. Before him no one dared to leave the church. But he never enjoyed communion. Van Buren attended the Reformed Church at home and the Episcopal Church in Washington, but he was not a member. Polk went to the Presbyterian church every Sunday morning. His wife was a member there; he was not. Gen. Taylor attended the Episcopal church, but not regularly. Pierce was a member and regular attendant of the Presbyterian church, but not a full (communion) member. He never went to communion. Buchanan attended the Presbyterian Church regularly. He was also President of the Trustees of the Reformed College at Lancaster. But member he was not. Lincoln attended the Presbyterian Church regularly. His wife was a member, he was not. Grant's wife is a member of the Methodist Church. He himself is a regular churchgoer, but not a member. - Most of all these Presidents were not baptized." (Evangelist.)

American Bible and Tract Society. The former held its third and fiftieth annual meetings at New York, May 13. The annual report is as follows: Total amount of books printed during the year in the Bible House 1,081,820; abroad 262,000; whole emulation 1,386,611 volumes; books sold 929,000; gratuitous distribution and appropriations to the amount of 181,881 dollars, of which 72,912 for foreign countries. The restoration of the Bible Society in the Southern States has been accomplished. In the last three years 1,800,000 families were visited by colporteurs in the United States, and 157,000 Bibles were distributed. - The American Tract Society held its fourth and fortieth annual meeting in New York on May 12. According to the annual report, 326 new books and tracts were printed in eight languages during the past year. - The number of volumes printed during the past year is 307,000, and the number of publications 9,493,400. Altogether for four and forty years 23,684,339 volumes; 306,302, 287 publications. Monthly publications 564,833; on the Society's list 4230, of which 838 are volumes, besides 3862 in one hundred and forty languages and dialects for circulation in other countries.

(From the Lutheran Church Fr.)

Union of the Presbyterians of the old and new schools. The two General Assemblies of Presbyterians in America, which have since 1838 separated into "old" and "new" schools, have adopted a plan of reunion at New York, the assembly of the new school unanimously, and that of the old school by 275 votes to 9. The several presbyteries are now to vote again on the proposed plan, and the two assemblies are to meet in Pittsburg the first week of November this year, there to be merged into one. The "old school" numbers 252,555, the "new school" 168,932 communicants. (Luth. Zeitschr.)

II. Abroad.

The General Lutheran Conference. How did this conference, which came into being last year at Hanover with such great hopes and much noise, develop? The child - if such a comparison is permitted - was sickly from the beginning. It suffered from too much diplomacy. Instead of opposing the unionist mishmash faith with the one Scriptural glan of the Concordia formula, and if that had had even a very small handful of representatives, and instead of trusting so solely to the power of truth, comfort and strength were sought in the multitude and great scholarship of many who called themselves Lutheran. Lutheran crowds were set against unionist crowds, and because Lutherans were pouring in from all regions, and because, due to the political situation, the spirits were in a higher mood, there was no lack of enthusiasm. For this reason, this conference was praised and commended from many sides as a healthy, strong, and exceptionally promising Lutheran offspring. Now a year has passed, the closer conference has met in Brunswick, and "important matters" have been discussed and decided upon. The question is now obvious: How has this Lutheran offspring developed? Unfortunately, symptoms of growing unhealthiness are appearing. For the Conference has grown in unionist breadth and width, and diminished in courage and vigorous appearance. - This can be seen in two facts that we want to share with you. The Prussian Vereins-Lutherans or LandeSkirchen-Lutherans are becoming increasingly dull and blunt in their struggle against the Union and are unfortunately sinking back deeper into Unionist confusion and lack of conscience. The Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt complains of this as follows:

"That the Lutherans in the Prussian State Church would one day really take the matter seriously and renounce the Union in principle and in fact, especially by expressly denouncing the communion of the Lord's Supper, is something we have always wished for and hoped for in love. Although our hopes were severely dashed by the statements and messages in this year's preface of the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, it is again a painful surprise to us that the Volksblatt für Stadt und Land, which, as far as we know, among all Prussian papers belonging to the national church, has testified most decisively against the Union, now expresses itself in such a way that one can clearly see that the Verein Lutherans do not want to be helped out of their unclear position, but want to make their peace with the Union. In No. 7 of this newspaper, the editor of the Volksblatt expresses the lively wish, both for the Allgemeine Lutherische Kirchenzeitung and for the Lutherans outside the Prussian Church, that they might hold fast to the threefold consciousness:

1. That that union which consists in a hospitable attitude at the table of the Lord and in an organic community of the regiment will certainly not perish again in Old Prussia (which he also does not wish).
2. That this union, which exists in Old Prussia, will, according to the aspects of the time, almost inevitably become the norm of the ecclesiastical formations of Germany (which he likewise does not wish otherwise).
3. That the establishment and shaping of this union is the center of today's ecclesiastical struggle and its decisive position in the face of the attempts of unionism, which has always wanted to substitute another one for it and now wants it more than ever. Therefore, one would like to place oneself emphatically from the outset on the common and only promising and tenable position, but not on such a position that sooner or later will turn out to be a lost cause.

Methinks it is plain. Should it ever be so - how we would have liked it to be otherwise! -we can only rejoice that it is openly said. The Committee of the General Lutheran Conference, which will meet in the next few days in Brunswick and will deliberate on the request of the Verein Lutherans to admit members from among themselves to the Committee, is now confronted with such a clear position on the part of those Verein Lutherans that it will have no choice but to reject this request decisively, unless the Verein Lutherans first fundamentally change their position on the Union, which would be the most desirable thing for us. We, who from the beginning have been able to support the inclusion of the Vereins-Lutherans only in the sense that they should thereby be helped out of their unclear position, ask the Committee most urgently to answer their request in this sense. A contrary decision would be fatal for the Conference; even a postponement of the decision, if it should be possible, seems to us to be justified by nothing."

Well, the Committee of the General Lutheran Conference met on April 7, and what did it decide "concerning the participation of the Lutheran brethren in the Prussian Regional Church"? The following: "Although the 'Regulations for the Allgem. Although the 'Regulations for the General Lutheran Conference' state in the entrance that the purpose of the Conference is 'to bring the members of the various Lutheran church regions of Germany closer together for the cultivation of their fellowship and for the understanding of their common interests', and although it cannot be denied that the Lutheran brethren in the Prussian Regional Church do not belong to a 'Lutheran church region', they may nevertheless be members of the Conference for the sake of their personal confession according to § 2 of the Regulations *), and because of this Lutheran confession it is also recognized as permissible to admit someone of them to the further committee." - It was further resolved to invite the Association Lutheran, Superintendent Arndt in Wernigerode, to join the Committee. - This is the first sign of the increasing sickliness of the Lutheran Conference - it is becoming more unionistic. Now the second.

How extraordinarily necessary, especially now in Germany, would be a gathering of faithful Lutherans who would first try to bring light and clarity into the horrible, soul-destroying, church-destroying confusion within the Lutheran camp itself. It is purely impossible that the Lutheran Church can be preserved against the onrushing Union if it does not know its own walls and fortifications, yes, if it also places pantheists and Arians on its battlements and towers, and excludes from the Council of War Unionists with a pronounced Union practice, with communion. Not the external Lutheran name, not science, not doubt, not open questions, not unbelief, but faith alone overcomes the world and the freer unionist world religion. Who is a Lutheran? And when must a Lutheran, for the sake of his conscience, leave a corrupt, perishing national church? These are the burning questions that a Lutheran Conference, which has true love for the Lutheran Church, should answer roundly and clearly and distinctly. Not Zezschwitzian, theological-philosophical development experiments in the higher style are a need of the church and are necessary. Oh no, the Lutheran people want and must have something in order to be able to take the right course in the hour of decision and to be able to take certain steps on the right side in the battle. That is where the Lutheran Conference should help. But of course, if they take hold of it, the crowd will infallibly melt away. One can then no longer impress the great unionist house so much, the present, inner, "unionist" house.

*Every Lutheran who submits to these provisions by signing them is entitled to actively participate in the otherwise public meetings of the General Lutheran Conference.

Discord will come to light, one will experience ridicule and scorn. It is also very questionable whether this year, since a political cooling has occurred in certain circles, such an enthusiastic gathering as last year in Hanover would take place again. One is therefore cautious, somewhat anxious, one tries to lavirate, to delay the decision. In Brunswick, therefore, an agreement is reached on "the holding of a general conference": "to refrain from such a conference this year, but to consider it for next year in connection with the annual festival of the Lutheran mission in Leipzig during the week of Pentecost. So only "to consider", not even to decide. The annual festival of the Lutheran Mission in Leipzig is to be the staff on which the sick child sustains itself. If only it does not soon die a premature death. -

It is surprising that the narrower conference has also called upon the Geh. Justiz-Rath Dr. Huschke to join the committee. After the public debate of the Breslauers in their journal, the Conference can only expect a decisive rejection of Huschke. The separated Lutherans do not want to, and cannot, recognize the Verein Lutherans as Lutherans without giving themselves up. And the Breslauers, in spite of their various heresies, do not look as if they would join the Conference merely to help strengthen it numerically, or to gain more support as members of such a large Conference. We will report in due time what Huschke replied to this invitation. - The Immanuels-Lutherans are completely out of step with the invitations to the Committee, although they had just declared themselves well satisfied with the Conference. Whether the Rev. Dietrich's somewhat sour mood will be particularly sweetened is questionable. - B.

Leipzig. According to the "Dresdner Journal" the former secretary of the Archbishop of Prague, Franciscan monk Jäger, who served as confessor to the King of Saxony in 1866, has become a Protestant and preached a few days ago in the Lutheran Court Church at Dresden. Her. d. Gl.

Austria. The new law on education has been published. The most essential innovation of it, as far as it concerns the elementary school as such, consists in the fact that every public elementary school has been deprived of its exclusively confessional character. However, every elementary school to the foundation or maintenance of which the State, the Land or the local community contributes the costs in whole or in part is declared to be a public institution. Religious instruction shall be given by the church authorities concerned within the framework of the plan approved by the Ministry or the Land school authority. Attendance at school is compulsory from the age of 6 until the age of 14, and pupils may only be dismissed when they have acquired the necessary knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic. It is hoped that the implementation of this law will enable Austria to make great progress. (Reform. Kirchenzeitung.)

>>>> An article has just appeared from the "*Lutheran Standard*" on the we have previously called attention to, in pamphlet form under the title:

The doctrine of justification, by Rev. M. Loy, Prof. Theol. in the Ev. Luth. Seminary at Columbus, O.

Comprising 181 pages in 8vo and bound, the booklet costs 65 cents (exclus. Postage in the amount of 8 cents); to be had at J. A. Schulze, Columbus, O.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 15. September 1869. No. 9.

Materialien zur Pastoraltheologie, mitgetheilt von C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 36.

If the preacher is called to a dying man, he must remind him of his sins, but above all (in whatever state he may have been in life and however he may have lived) he must point him to Christ, and recite to him such well-known sayings and such hymns and sighs as attract him to Christ as the only and certain helper from sin, death, the devil, and hell; to ask him whether he recognizes himself as a poor, naturally lost sinner, and whether he places his trust in Christ alone, and therefore wants to die in him, - and if he answers in the affirmative, to comfort him in this. If he loses consciousness, the preacher joins with those present in an intercession on his knees. If death has occurred, he blesses the deceased with the laying on of hands (according to Seidel's instructions) with the following words: "God the Father, what you have created, God the Son, what you have redeemed, God the Holy Spirit, what you have sanctified, I commend to your faithful hands. Amen!" After which the Lord's Prayer may be said at the end.

Note I.

For the manner in which Holy Communion is to be administered to those who are already dying, see § 18, note 2 ("Lehre und Wehre" XIII, 161. f.).

Note 2.

The godly Mathesius writes: "Whoever spares it (the Holy Communion) until then (until the hour of death), I do not call him to be forgiven.

For the thief came just before the door was shut, though he came late, Luk 23. But it is a bad and dangerous thing, if a man will not lift up his eyes until they are broken, and his tongue is half frozen (as it is also known by way of example, that the soul of the sick is gone out, when the hostia is still on the tongue). But the true thief comes late, but he misses nothing, for he confesses his sin and punishes his neighbor, and publicly confesses with his mouth Jesus Christ, that he is a king and the Son of God, and the only Advocate and Mediator, who remembers poor sinners in the best of his heavenly Father. If any man did so at the last, it would be another opinion. Augustine says: *Poenitentia vera nunquam est sera, sed sera raro est vera,* i.e.: True repentance is never a late one, but the late one is seldom a true one." (Postille. Nuremberg, 1565. 161. 135.) It is, indeed, true, that repentance is not so trifling a work, consisting in nothing more than lip-service', "God, be merciful to me a sinner!" as many sure sinners think. True faith does not arise in a heart through the gospel, unless the law has first done its work, uncovering the unspeakable corruption of the heart, breaking it, softening it, and making it hungry and thirsty for grace. But if one is dealing with a dying man, and it is therefore impossible to make a thorough exploration with him, there is nothing left but to show him, after a brief presentation of the law, first of all the Lamb of God who bears the sin of the world. If the dying man can still be saved, it can only be through the latter: Therefore the servant of Christ must not refrain from saying that the dying man was as he pleased before. This knowledge has always been in Christendom, even in the darkest times of it. Known is the conversation which is found in an agendum prepared by Anselm of Canterbury, d. 1109, especially for the visit at the sickbed. It reads as follows:

"Brother, art thou glad that thou shalt die in faith? - Do you confess that you have not lived as well as you should have? - Yes. - Do you have the will to mend your ways, if you were given time? - Do you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, died for your sake? - Yes. - Do you believe that by his death alone you can be saved? - Yes. - Do you thank him with all your heart? - Do you thank him from the bottom of your heart? ----------So then, as long as your soul is in you, always give thanks to him, and in this death alone put all your trust. To this death abandon thyself entirely, with this death cover thyself entirely, and in it enfold thyself entirely. And if the Lord would condemn thee, say, Lord, I cast the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thee and thy judgment; otherwise I will not contend with thee. And if he said that thou deservedest condemnation, then

Saying, I put the death of our Lord JESUS Christ between me and the evil that I have earned; the merit of his precious suffering I offer instead of the merit that I ought to have and have not. He saith further, The death of our Lord JEsu Christ I put between me and Thy wrath. Finally he says three times: "Lord, into your hands I commend my spirit. And those of his convent who are present may answer, "Lord, into Your hands we commend his spirit. And so he shall die in peace, and shall not see death for ever." (S. *Examen Concil. Trid. per M. Chemnitium scriptum, ed. ed. Preuss. Berolini,* 1861. p. 164.) A truly evangelical instruction for blessed dying is found in "Dr. M. Luther's Sermon of Preparation for Dying," dated 1519. (Tom. X, 2292-2313. Erlangen XXI, 253. ff.)

Note 3.

On how to prepare those for death who have been sentenced to death for their crimes, see Porta's Pastorale Lutheri Cap. 18. § 10. Felix Bidembach's *Manuale ministrorum ecclesiae pp. 744-766. 2. Bartmann'd Pastorale evangel.* p. 1320-1332. (Excerpt from the Lower Saxon Church Order.) Seidel's Pastoraltheologie Th. I. Cap. 14. p. 230-244. Especially the last-named book contains many excellent special practical hints, to which the editor of the 1769 edition, F. E. Rambach, has added some quite valuable additions. Seidel states the following rules: 1. "During the first visit of the delinquent, a preacher must see to it that he gives him a good opinion of his person. He should therefore be careful, for example, not to ask the prisoner about the cause of his imprisonment. *(2) "He is bound to give the delinquent a sufficient knowledge of the way to salvation." 3. "A preacher is bound to present to the person condemned to death the reasons which may induce him to endure with joy a violent and, in the eyes of the world, shameful death †)." (4) "Finally, a preacher is bound to accompany the condemned man to the place of judgment and to stand by him with his acclamation until the last moment.

(To be continued.)

*) Other theologians, such as Bidembach, advise the opposite, namely, that the preacher should ask this question in order to be able to infer the state of the prisoner's soul from the answer.

†) Rambach rightly warns against wanting to demand the joy of dying of a martyr from one who is dying for the sake of his misdeed, and then wanting to flaunt his penance.

(For the "Doctrine and Defense.")

The four kingdoms of Daniel. *)

Apart from the Messianic prophecies, there are hardly any prophecies of the Old? Apart from the Messianic prophecies, hardly any Old Testament prophecies are more important for us Christians than those we find in the second and seventh chapters of the prophet Daniel. According to the ecclesiastical interpretation, these two chapters speak of four great world empires and the continuance of the last of them until the last day. The importance which these prophecies have for us for the sake of this content is increased by the fact that, after rejecting the ecclesiastical interpretation, one wants to use these prophecies to suspect the authenticity of the Book of Daniel and to transfer its writing from the time of the exile to the much later time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in that one also wants to find in these two chapters the history of worldly kingdoms only up to the time of that great enemy of the Jews. A closer look at these prophecies can therefore strengthen the belief in the truth of the Bible in general and the conviction of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel in particular.

In this paper, after some remarks on the text in general, we will hear and examine the ecclesiastical interpretation of the individual passages, and then we will examine the three most prominent of the interpretations which are opposed to the ecclesiastical one.

In the second chapter we hear how Daniel tells Nebuchadnezzar about a dream that had escaped him and then interprets it. The king had there a statue of gigantic size and (according to the Hebrew) special shine ashes. The head was of fine gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and the loins of brass, the thighs of iron, the feet of clay and iron. There were four kinds of metal on this statue; each part of it, consisting of a different metal, pointed to a kingdom. Dgl. Cap. 2, 39. 40. The difference of the metal points to a difference of the kingdoms. Cf. chap. 2, 39. There are not five but four symbolized kingdoms, so that the feet and toes made of clay and iron (Cap. 2, 42.) symbolize the same kingdom as the iron legs and only point to the later decay of the same. Dgl. Cap. 2, 41-43.

While Cap. 2. reports a dream-face of Nebucadnezzar, we hear Cap. 7. of a dream-face of Daniel. Out of the dream vision of Daniel, which is

*) The following work, initially intended for a conference, is published by special decision of that conference. The historical information contained therein is taken from Dittmar's World History and often reproduced in his own words, without this always being otherwise indicated. A. d. E.

Daniel sees four beasts rising from the sea, each different from the other. These four animals again symbolize, as Cap. 7, 23. teaches, four kingdoms; their different shape again, like Cap. 2. 2, the difference of the metals, indicates a different nature of the kingdoms. Cf. Cap. 7, 7. 19. with 23. That these two dream-gestures deal with quite the same kingdoms, is almost without exception acknowledged by the commentators. And not without reason. If we compare the two visions, we find a striking similarity between them. In both we meet four kingdoms. The first of these is in both cases the empire of which Nebucadnezzar was the actual founder, as Cap. 2, 37. 38. is expressly stated, and Cap. 7, 4: is implied by referring to Cap. 4. by Nebucadnezzar himself being alluded to in a letter. The third kingdom is Cap. 2, 39. as one that will rule over all lands, and so then Cap. 7, 6. is said of the third kingdom that power was given to it. Finally, the resemblance is in the description of the fourth kingdom, Cap. 2, 40. and Cap. 7, 7. is quite striking. To this is added that also Cap. 2, 44. and Cap. 7, 26. 27. no other worldly kingdom, but the eternal kingdom of the Messiah is to follow these kingdoms. In both dream stories, therefore, the same four kingdoms are spoken of. The division given in Cap. 2, 44. is also valid in chapter 7, which is a change not of the dynasty but of the ruling people.

Let us now proceed to the ecclesiastical interpretation of this double dream-face, looking each time at the text dealing with each kingdom.

I. The ecclesiastical interpretation.

1. the Chaldean-Babylonian empire.

The text dealing with the first kingdom is Cap. 2:32: "The head of that image was of fine gold," and Cap. 7:4: "The first was like a lion, and had wings like an eagle. I watched until its wings were plucked out; and it was taken from the earth, and stood on its feet like a man, and a human heart was given to it".

Which kingdom is symbolized by the head of fine gold at first Cap. 2. is symbolized by the head of fine gold, is clear; it is the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar. "Thou art the head of gold," say Daniel and his comrades Cap. 2, 38. to Nebuchadnezzar. Whether the kingdom was meant here only as long as it stood under Nebuchadnezzar, or also under the reign of his successors, is a question to which we shall come later in some words. In any case, however, the golden head is not a symbol of Nebuchadnezzar for his person, but a symbol of the kingdom.

as the founder and representative of this kingdom. As the other parts denote empires (cf. Cap. 2, 39. 40.), so also this one.

This kingdom, the Chaldean-Babylonian, is symbolized by the head of the statue, because as the head is the uppermost part of man, so the Chaldean-Babylonian is the first of the four kingdoms under consideration here (Vulture, Calov). But why is the same symbolized by a head of fine gold? Some think that this is to be understood ethically, from the moral state of the empire; others, that the weakness of the empire is indicated here; others, that it refers to the clemency shown to the Jews in captivity; others, that it is a matter of the wealth of this empire; others, that the expansion of it comes into consideration here; others still differently. Now, though most of these may be true, it can scarcely be proved of all that special consideration is given to this. - If we compare the Scriptures, we find that gold, being the purest, most beautiful, most perfect, and most precious of metals, is the symbol of something excellent in its kind. Cf. Job 23:10; Ps. 19:11; Prov. 22:1, &c. What the boron of this kingdom consisted of, which is still emphasized by the fine gold, is shown to us by the interpretation of this dream-face Dan. 2, 37. 38. to which Dan. 4, 19. compare Is. 47, 5. This kingdom is symbolized by a head of fine gold, because its kings were "kings over all kings", which does not mean over all kings of the whole earth, but only similar to "the chief over all chiefs", Deut. 3, 32, indicating a dominion over others, similar to "servant of all servants", Gen. 9, 25, meaning a deep humiliation. Cf. Jer. 25, Ezek. 29, 19, f., Hab. 1, 6, ff., especially v. 10. Therefore this kingdom also bore the name "woman over kingdoms," Isa. 47, 5. "King of kings" is also the name of Nebuchadnezzar, Ezek. 26, 7, while we read of Evilmerodach, one of his successors, 2 Kings 25, 27, 28, that he had kings with him at Babylon. In this respect, the Chaldean-Babylonian empire is symbolized by a head of fine gold.

But then this is also done with regard to the power, strength and honor of this kingdom. See Dan. 2, 37. Even the mighty Roman Empire did not have such power and authority over all parts belonging to it as this Chaldean-Babylonian Empire, even though it did not become as old as the latter. A short historical account will not be out of place here.

After the Old Assyrian empire had fallen in 888 B.C. and the New Assyrian had been founded by a change of dynasties, whereby, however, Media became independent, Nabupolassar, sub-king of Babylonia, made a rebellion and conquered Nineveh with Kyaxares of Media in 625 B.C. Nabupolassar now founded the New Assyrian empire, the

Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, Syria, and the kingdom of Israel. He was succeeded by his son Nebuchadnezzar, who raised Babylonia to a world power. "He was one of the mightiest princes that Asia had ever seen, and the splendor of his power was such as it had never been since mythical times." (Dittmar.) "His name filled the world, and as his reputation drew noble Greeks under its banners, and resounded in all the courts of the West, so certainly did the wise men of the Indus hear it. When the Greeks became rulers in the Orient, they found (according to Strabo) his name famous, as that of a world-conqueror. Nebucadnezzar also has been more than an ordinary Oriental happy conqueror. He consolidated an empire which had fallen to his father (in the last years of the latter's life) out of the inheritance of a state already quite disintegrated, and composed of the most diverse elements, with a domestic power which had no hereditary tradition for his dynasty, and established it so firmly that no apostasy took place among his successors until the whole empire came to an end; nay, so firmly that the habit of obedience to which he had compelled the most turbulent nations, subdued to the conqueror of Babylon all the rest of the empire without a stroke of the sword." (M. Niebuhr.)

According to Daniel's own interpretation, then, the head of fine gold symbolizes a strong, glorious empire, such as the Chaldean-Babylonian empire was, especially under Nebuchadnezzar.

Let us now proceed to the consideration of the text belonging to it in Cap. 7. There the first kingdom appears under the symbol of a lion, which has wings like an eagle. As gold is distinguished among metals, so the lion and the eagle are distinguished among animals and birds. The lion is said to be the king of beasts, Prov. 30, 29. 30. and is therefore the image of royal power and greatness, 1 Kings 10, 19. 20.; it is strong, 2 Sam. 1, 23. and therefore the image of God, Jef. 38, 13., and of Christ, Rev. 5, 5.; he is fearless, 2 Sam. 17, 10., Prov. 28, 4., 30, 30., and therefore image of hearty, powerful, mighty men, Deut. 23. 24., 24, 9., 2 Sam. 23, 20., as well as of God, Isa. 31, 4.; he is a cruel beast of prey, Deut. 33, 20., 1 Kings 13, 24., and therefore image of impious, fierce, and bloodthirsty enemies, Ps. 35, 17., 57, 5. 7., 7, 3., 17, 11. 12., Jer. 2, 15., Ezek. 19, 3. 5. 6., 32, 2. hence also ascribed to such enemies the lion's night, Ps. 22, 22. and also the lion's teeth, Ps. 58, 7., Joel 1, 6. hence also image of the devil, 1 Pet. 5, 8., of God, Hof. 5, 14., 13,7.8.; he is terrible because of fine roaring, which is a picture of divine wrath, Joel 3, 21., Amos 3, 8. - The lion in our picture has now also eagle's wings. The eagle applies to the king of birds, and is therefore the image of mighty kings, Ezek. 17, 3. 7. compare with v. 12,

15. ff; he has large, strong wings, which are therefore the image of strength and protection, Ex. 19, 4.; he flies exalted and strong, Isa. 40, 31., nimble, Jer. 4, 13., 48, 40., 49, 22., and high, Prov. 23, 5., 30, 19., Hos. 8, 1. Otherwise wings also mean swiftness, Rev. 12, 14.

If we now ask how far the Chaldean-Babylonian empire can be symbolized by a lion with eagle's wings, we recall what has already been mentioned, that this empire was distinguished above other empires, so that it bore the name "Lady over Kingdoms" and its rulers were called "Kings of Kings. As the lion among beasts, so was this kingdom excellent among the kingdoms of that time. It was also a strong kingdom, fearless, swift, and soaring in its thoughts. (Isa. 14:13, 14.) Its internal strength, so that there was no apostasy among Nebuchadnezzar's successors, has already been pointed out; but it was also strong outwardly under Nebuchadnezzar, who incorporated a number of countries into his kingdom with great strength and speed. When his father Nabupolassar had founded the New Babylonian Empire, Nebucadnezzar defeated the Pharaoh Necho of Egypt at Carchemish in 606 B.C. and thus already raised the empire to a world power. He now advanced without stay to subdue all in the southwest. Judah became liable to rents, and Nebuchadnezzar moved on to the border of Egypt. When he received the news of his father's death, he hurried on camels to Babylon in eight days and ascended the throne of his father. While he now first of all brought the mountain peoples in the East to. recognition of his authority, his commanders in the west kept Egypt in check and Syria at rest. In the third year after his accession he sent out raiding hordes against Jehoiakim, king of Judah, who rebelled, to lay waste the country, and then himself marched up and took Jerusalem. From this he made two wars, against the Medes and against the turbulent Elamites, victorious, and conquered, yea, destroyed Jerusalem, when Zedekiah rose up. In the meantime he had also taken Egypt and turned against Tyre, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Edomites and the Philistines, all of whom he defeated. In his victorious march he is said to have advanced even to the Pillars of Hercules. All this he accomplished in about 26 years, for of his 43 years' reign he seems to have spent the last 9 or 10 years in peace, while he had to spend seven earlier years in madness as punishment for his arrogance. - Under Nebuchadnezzar, however, the empire could be compared to a winged lion, as Nebuchadnezzar himself, Ezek. 17:3, 12, appears under the image of an eagle.

Our ancient commentators understand the image of the winged lion of the Chaldean-Babylonian empire not only under Nebuchadnezzar's reign, but also under that of his successors, and think the Chaldeans and

Babylonians were compared to a lion because of their courage and strength, because of their ferocity, lust, and arrogance, which qualities were especially manifested in some of their kings; but they were compared to an eagle because of their swiftness, their eminence among the other kingdoms, and their haughtiness.

Under Nebuchadnezzar's successors the empire began to decline, and what is said further on in the text was fulfilled. For though here allusion is made to the incidents narrated Cap. 4. is alluded to, we must not interpret the words themselves, since otherwise everything said about the first kingdom would have been fulfilled long before Daniel had this dream-face, and therefore nothing would have been prophesied here about the first kingdom. Against such an interpretation also speaks that the lion's wings are plucked out according to our text, while the story Dan. 4. knows nothing about it.

But let us look more closely at the text itself. It says: "I watched until its wings were plucked out. Thus, it loses its advantage symbolized by the wings, yes, since the feathers do not gradually fall out of themselves, but are forcibly plucked out, these words indicate a painful humiliation by others, as we find prophesied in Isa 47. Our ancient commentators also understand these words of a state of decay. - Luther then translates further, "And it was taken from the earth." The relation of the Hebrew words rendered by these words is in dispute. Vulture and Calov stop at Luther's translation, others want: The wings were plucked out of it, "with which it had risen above the earth." And, indeed, the word which Luther here translates "take away," we find rendered "lift up," in another place, Dan. 4, 31. If the latter translation is the correct one, nothing new is actually said with these words, but only the deep humiliation for the former pride is emphasized the more. If, however, one adheres to Luther's translation, one must understand the words to mean the complete destruction of the empire (as Geier and Calov do). At least in this sense a similar expression is found in Ps. 102, 25. It then goes on to say: "And he stood on his feet like a man, and a human heart was given to him. That a great change is indicated by these words is evident, but whether for the better or for the worse is the question. Some may think that the lion's form was changed into a human form, but there is nothing of this in the text. But even if it were, it would not follow that a change for the better was indicated, for in courage and strength man is not equal to the lion. But a close attention to the text will show that we can only think of a decline of the kingdom, as also vulture

and Calov interpret these words. *) "It stood on its feet like a man." Before this the beast had stood on four feet, as a lion usually does, but now it was erect and stood on its hind feet. This is probably only meant to indicate that although the animal still had its former strength, it was no longer able to use it to attack and defend itself. The beast stands erect, unsteady, wavering, like a man standing on one leg. - When it says, "He was given a human heart," these words also point to the decay of the kingdom. The Scriptures refer to the heart as the seat of courage, Gen. 42:28, Deut. 1:28, Deut. 20:3, Isa. 5:1, Jer. 4:9, and others, as our language does when we call courage heartiness. Now, instead of the lion's heart, the beast gets a human heart, which is a defiant and despondent thing, Jer. 17:9, and even in the best case has only a courage similar to the lion's courage. The fact that Scripture often uses the word "man" in a contemptuous sense also speaks for the fact that we have to think of decay here. See Job 25:6, Psalm 9:21, so that in these words the loss of the former courage is indicated.

What is prophesied here really happened after Nebuchadnezzar's death. Under his successors the empire was still strong inwardly, but outwardly it no longer showed such fearful strength and heartiness to its enemies, and at last it was deeply humiliated and destroyed. "After Nebuchadnezzar's death (561 B.C.) the Babylonian power began to decline again. His son and successor Evilmerodach," a voluptuary and tyrant, "was killed by his brother-in-law Neriglisar already in the second year of his reign. The latter fell into war with the Medopersians and summoned King Croesus of Lydia to protect him, but was killed in a battle against the Median king Astyages in 555 BC. His successor Laborosoarchod, still a boy, was put out of the way after only eight months by the great men of the empire, which needed a man, and after a joint decision one of the conspirators, Naboned, a kinsman of the royal house, was placed on the throne. Under him and his son and co-ruler, Belshazzar, mentioned in the Bible, Babylon's power collapsed through the medoperfic...

*Luther, however, has a different opinion when he says in his preface to the prophet Daniel: "Now the first beast is the kingdom of Assyria and Babylon, that is, the lion with the two eagle's wings, for it is the noblest and best and (as said above) the golden kingdom of all. The two wings are the two parts of the kingdom, Assyria and Babylon. And a human heart is given unto it, and it standeth upon its feet: for there hath not been such a king of other kingdoms, that hath come to the knowledge of God so strangely, neither hath there been so many great, holy, wise men in the court, as this kingdom." (Walch IX, 1438.)

men." (Dittmar.) The story of how Belshazzar, a wanton and yet at the same time fiery-hearted and dissolute man, lost his kingdom and life is found in Dan. 5. In the year 536 B.C. the mighty kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar fell by the fall of Babylon and became a part of the Medo-Persian empire.

(To be continued.)

How a faithful pastor who is distressed about the spiritual condition of his congregation can compose himself in his mind.

In Blessed Philip David Burk's "Collections on Pastoral Theology," etc., there is a correspondence between him and a younger brother minister, which was a great blessing to the sender 21 years ago, which he often reread afterwards and read to others, and which he recently decided to make common knowledge for other brothers ministers.

---

*M. Philipp David Burk, Bengel's pupil, vicar and later daughterman, born July 26, 1741, died March 22, 1770 as Special-Superintendent at Kirchheim u. T. in Württemberg. When he administered the deanery of Merkgröningen from 1758-1768, he earned the trust and love of the pastors of the deanery, especially through the monthly conferences he organized, "in order to pray together for the awakening of collegial love, to contemplate the Word of God, to share the sermons preached, and to discuss all kinds of ministry experiences and things that belonged to the building of the Kingdom of God. About his intercourse with the pastors of his diocese and the members of his congregation it says: "In his intercourse with his pastors he always held himself truly as their brother and colleague, as he generally showed a cheerful and joyful love in his intercourse and in all his official duties. He possessed a special skill in using every meeting with others as a sweet testimony of Christ, and he knew how to speak to common people and children in a way that won their hearts. The children, whom he taught in a childlike and simple manner, were so attached to him that they were eager to greet him as soon as he crossed the street, since it was seldom without good memories of the tender little ones' hearts. The following testimony provides a glimpse into the peculiarity of his inner conduct: "Just as he was never full in the flesh, but also never lacking, so his inner state of heart was mostly dry, narrow, sparingly meek through the hustle and bustle, and yet he was not ever lacking in good certainty and confident joy. He called this an average kind of leadership, "in which God always kept it so orderly and moderate with him". When, in the last three years of his life, he was overburdened by his position as Special-Superintendent with all kinds of distracting work that tired body and soul, and felt the frailty of his body more and more, he complained that he became as tired every day as a day labourer and that sleepless nights set in, but above all that his "best nourishment, the meditation of the Word of God", was weakened and withdrawn from him every week; but it was a complaint without a murmur, for with all his longing for salvation and the body of the resurrection, he confessed: "Forgivably I desire to become not just soon or late, but only duly ripe for eternity".

was called upon again. It is also true that although it was written in the previous century and for the congregations of the old homeland, this correspondence is so appropriate for us pastors here that the first letter of complaint from the younger brother seems to be written from the soul, but that everyone who follows the healthy, truly evangelical instruction given in Burks' two answers will find everything else in this correspondence confirmed by experience.

I have received the following detailed letter, writes Burk, to my no small pleasure:

---------- "Since I was sent here, I am sorry to say I encountered a most confused state here.

My poor listeners were blindly walking under the heavy pressure of sins, without feeling it, in a thousand prejudices in which they had been brought up from their youth. Most of them also lacked a literal knowledge. They had nothing but their blind desires and inclinations for unholy leaders, and especially some vices and gross transgressions against the holy commandments of God were so general and so deeply ingrained in them that they did them without fear and did not even consider them sins. There was a wild, rough nature among them, which made them recognizable to all other people, even in other places.

This is how I would find my poor congregation, after taking much pains to examine and scrutinize them and their actions closely.

I was tremendously depressed by such a miserable condition, lost all hope at first (I will honestly confess), and would have gladly left here again, if only it had been possible, leaving the important station entrusted to me.

In such miserable circumstances I took recourse to prayer, urged myself in silence with many tears to the Father-heart of my God, and asked him not to abandon me in this distress when I took up my office, but to help me poor, miserable, ignorant people with his mighty grace and to work on this poor church myself, but also to give me an idea of how I should attack it.

For a long time I felt no comfort in myself, and my pusillanimity would not cease. I prayed more and more fervently.

It finally got easier for me.

I got up comforted by prayer, attacked the work with the help of my God, tried it out at first with pure love, also let go of many a disorder that would in fact have been criminal, with a loving but serious reminder: but in doing so I achieved nothing more than

that I was laughed at by most people, and that I unfortunately had to learn that some disorders became more and more prevalent the longer it went on.

I then became more serious, preached more the law than the gospel, and began to put an end to the torn-up disorders in the church conventually, sometimes even with punishments.

But also through this the final purpose was not reached. A servile fear came among my congregation, but a real love for God and for me as the pastor did not want to show itself.

Now I connect law and gospel, but even in this the desired improvement does not show.

I do indeed think that I sometimes perceive some change, some impression, in this or that soul. But it is of no duration, and many a listener who leaves the church or in private with extremely wet cheeks, commits again on the way, before he comes home, that disorder over whose punishment his heart is broken.

This state of affairs makes me anxious, and if honest souls from outside did not come to me from time to time and inspire me with courage, and if I did not find true honesty and sincerity of purpose in my work when I examine myself daily, I would feel even more anxious.

The special trust I have in your - makes me so bold as to write to you about these circumstances in such detail. I know for certain that you have compassion for me and for my congregation, and I therefore have the certain hope that they will have the kindness and love for me not only to assist me with good counsel, but also to include us especially in their strong prayers, and it is precisely for this reason that I am making this heartfelt request." -

My answer was as follows:

------"I praise God's grace, which works earnestly and powerfully on the heart of Ew. - (as I perceive).

You want advice from me, and you have the very best counselor close at hand. But because you desire it, love does not escape, as little as love spurns the slightest counsel of another poor sinner.

Above all, my dearest Collega, I beg you to look with steadfast eyes at the right foundation of your own heart in the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Many pastors do not do any good in their congregations because they work too hastily towards the improvement of their congregations before they themselves have sought rest for their souls with the Lord Jesus. This is a

apparent way, on which the pastors corrupt themselves and also give birth to nothing but error in their congregations.

I think you've noticed me. Seek for yourself grace and forgiveness of sins in the blood of the Son of God, as if you were not yet a pastor. Preach to your people for a while, not as a *superior* or *profectior,* but as one of their own: 'Come, let us be converted with one another. We want to stick together, I do not want to go any other way than the way I show you. I will show you no other way than that which I myself also will go.'

Whatever text or gospel you have before you to preach, think first of all how you will place your own heart toward it, and how you will make this word useful to your own state of soul. And this is what you then preach to the congregation.

You cannot believe how this little piece is so beneficial and also so powerful for the listeners. I have practiced it so much that I can't seem to change it.

After that, don't let your listeners' naughtiness make you either disheartened or discontented.

About your own sins, ineptitudes, shortcomings, etc. you may be grieved from the heart, and also preach with such a bowed heart. It is wholesome. There are penetrating lectures. But over your hearers' rebelliousness, or otherwise, it may have whatever name it likes, you are to sit over in the power of the office which is given you: that the hearers may not entertain a suspicion as if the minister were hostile to them, but that they must think: "The man loves us, he means well by us, and we wonder how he can be so kind to us, since he cannot like our doings and our nature. Love triumphs. Hatred stirs up strife. Law causes wrath. A cheerful talk with an unaffected, cheerful heart, without anger and doubt, they do or they do not, penetrates obliviously and masters the hearts even against their will.

Further, if they have any... ...so... ...you may, in vain, prefer it in the children's lesson, *discursive,* or in hearty private remembrances, without much exaggerating circumstance, in short...

But rather save the pulpit for the joyful proclamation of the blessed Gospel of Christ; as a herald who has come to B. to tell the people on God's account that He loves them, and that they may, if they will, enjoy His love in Christ JEsu eternally.

Further, just give heed: you certainly already have people in your congregation who stand in a readiness for grace, who pray heartily, who

Fear God, be attentive to the sermons, walk in silence, etc., and be like them. Seek them out from time to time, and act as one of their own, as if they themselves had no further insight and no higher purpose than these first beginnings of the fear of God and the love of the Word of God. Unnoticed and gradually you will be able to move forward with them, and the others will be wholesomely put to shame, or even come to them.

You must also think about this seriously. You will not win over most of your congregation. You have come to love the choice of the Lord Jesus. These shall and will be your spoils.

What to do with the rest, what to do with the big raw pile?

Nothing, but that one publicly and especially with honest revelation of the truth proves himself to their conscience, and leaves the success of it in time and eternity to the Lord. We would always like to have a whole, well-ordered and tidy congregation, around which we could flaunt ourselves. And the Lord is pleased with us if we pluck some fires out of the fire for him, but let those who do not want to be saved know that a witness of truth and messenger of peace has been with them.

The Lord we serve does not exaggerate us. Shall we exaggerate Him? Let it be far from that. We do what He has commanded us. Success is not in our power. But let Him be praised.

Finally, against good souls from abroad, I would not let myself be noted by my congregation as what I could say good of it, according to the truth, even if it were so small. It gives so much pleasure to gossip, then deprives the trust of its own listeners, and is even more harmful than useful to the good souls from abroad.

When guests come to me, I want them to find a man who likes to be where he is; who has an open heart, even toward guests, but a motherly heart toward his congregation; who makes everything work out for the best; who has ten years of patience, and after such years has passed can still preach the gospel with good courage. If it be not so, it is not right: for I am as lacking as my church. But if it is so, then I conclude from the courage God gives me to the blessing he will give me, and let me confidently remember this toward strangers and natives alike.

You see, in what sense I may now write to you for resolution, that I have no pity for you. It goes well, and if it is at your pleasure to reflect on the few things I have written, it will go still better." -

This was my letter at the time; the reply was long in coming (over the two years), but by grace turned out very pleasurably.

It read, as follows:

------ "At last I am preparing to pay a debt that I should have paid long ago. However, not with the intention of bringing it to oblivion, but only because I would have liked to give you some news of the honest application of the thorough instruction you have given me in love, because I know that you will praise the Lord with me about it.

Your - have had a much better and more exact knowledge of me and my congregation than I myself, and in your very kind letter have described our present circumstances so clearly that it could not have been done more clearly. Through this, a light has dawned on me, which I would perhaps have had to do without for a long time, because the ever-increasing sadness over the great rebelliousness of some of my listeners always kept my eyes closed, so that I could not see.

My Lord demands cheerfulness in his service: I was grieved in all my labours, because I thought it went off all fruitless.

My Lord is satisfied with one saved soul; I would have my whole church cast in another model.

My zeal went over my own defects, and only upon the defects of my hearers, and there it was quite natural (praise God! that I now see it) that I could penetrate nowhere.

I wept it honestly, I had not the slightest private gain for the purpose: the glory of God and the salvation of my hearers were quite near to my heart. I often examined myself about it, and yet my work did not want to gain any progress anywhere. This saddened me: it dampened all my spirits, it made me, I confess, quite ill-tempered, and I often wished that I had not become a pastor.

Oh how often I have bowed down to this, how ashamed I am that the fault, which I once wanted to blame entirely on my congregation, has been more with me than with my congregation.

Praise be to the Lord that He has called you to write what you have written to me.

Praise God! Now I can agree with you that it is going well. Even then, when I complained most vehemently, the Lord showed blessing from the word I preached, but I did not see Him: but now my eyes open better and better, since I see, even with the most vehement contradiction of my heart, more of my own deficiencies than of those of my hearers. I find souls among my congregation who have unmistakable

show signs that they are on the way to conversion.

There are souls that are put to shame by every sermon, that they strike their eyes beneath them and shed tears.

There are souls who, when they are walking on their evil ways, often feel uneasy about it, and when the opportunity arises, readily admit it: The priest is right, it is as he says, and they would like to be as he says.

Some are only held back by a miserable fear of man to publicly leave the world and go over to the flag of Jesus. That is how it is with us now. Now I no longer demand that your - pity me. O how well I am now content with my good Lord.

I still have many a reproach in my conscience that I myself was to blame for the fact that God's blessing could not reveal itself as soon and as clearly as he would have liked. But even these reproaches are good; they always bring me to more bending, to more earnest prayer, yes, they drive me ever closer to the heart of Jesus: such guidance is most necessary to me, and my good Lord judges Himself according to the condition and circumstances of my heart. Oh praise God! that it goes as it goes," and so on.

(Submitted.)

Some remarks on the doctrine of reincarnation.

The pastors of our northern district, as you know, were assembled in Milwaukee last June, among other things, to discuss the theses of Pastor Hügli on the doctrine of good works.

The record of the remarks made there has now had the misfortune to excite the displeasure of a critic who pours out his grief in the July number of Brobst'sche Monatshefte.

If only the critic had taken the trouble to read through our poor protocol with some attention beforehand! But something, paper or cover or title page, aroused his dislike to such a degree that he saw a hump where there was none.

The very title of the criticism testifies to the haste with which Mr. Critic has set about giving our Synod a little kick. It reads: "The Synodal Declaration of the Missouri Synod on the Relation of Justification and Regeneration," etc. A stranger who reads this will naturally think that the Synod of Missouri was together *in corpore* and made a synodical confession on 18

the relation of justification and regeneration. And is one word of it true? Not even one! For, first, it was not the Synod of Missouri that spoke, but its Northern District. Secondly, the District itself did not speak as a District, but individual members of it made certain remarks; and these are recorded. Thirdly, no one in Milwaukee spoke of regeneration or justification *ex professo,* but both doctrines were thought of in passing.

It is really just as bad and even worse than if the reviewer wanted to dismiss the well-known *speech of* Herr v. Zezschwitz on justification under the title: "The synodal declaration of the Lutherans of Germany assembled in Hanover on the doctrine of election"!

So, dearest Professor, let us rather say thus, "Casual remarks made at the fourteenth annual meeting of the Northern District of the Missouri Synod on the doctrine of justification and regeneration." For this would be true.

And now to the matter at hand: The remarks made in Milwaukee were directed against an error that is going on in Lutheran circles in Germany and which consists in calling all the baptized "born-again". Anyone who is even superficially acquainted with the Lutheran theological trend in Germany knows that this is the case there. Only a few years ago one of our friends who made a visit over there was quite unequivocally accused of Calvinism because he declared himself resolutely against such talk. But, strictly speaking, there are two errors in this wrong use of language: First, the erroneous opinion that regeneration is an inexplicable thing which cannot be lost even through mortal sins. Of this opinion it was rightly said in Milwaukee that it was not different from the doctrine of the papists of the indelible sign which is expressed by baptism.*) In order to protect those present against such an error, it was further pointed out that the regeneration of which the Lord speaks to Nicodemus is not a mere relationship, nor is it a magical character. But it is something physical in the theological sense; for in the new birth the heart, mind, and courage, indeed all the powers of man, are changed.) How does such a change happen? By faith, of course! For we teach with apology:

*) Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual - Meeting of the Northern District of the German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, &c. St. St. Louis, Mo. 1868. 8vo. Pp. 20. 21.,

†) Negotiations, page 20.

"They that obtain faith are born again." *) And with Quenstedt: "Under rebirth in the narrower sense is to be understood the bestowal of the powers of faith." **) So long, then, as one believes, he is also born again. If he loses faith, he also loses rebirth. This is our doctrine; not a further development of the old, neither a happy nor an unhappy one, but the old doctrine itself. For whereas the scientific gentlemen in Germany call the ungodly, who are baptized, members of the body of Christ, even though they have died, the Apology speaks thus, "Therefore in whom Christ by his Spirit worketh nothing, they are not members of Christ. †) For it is certain that all the ungodly are in the power of the devil, and are members of his kingdom, as St. Paul says to the Ephesians, that the devil reigns powerfully in the children of unbelief. And Christ saith unto the Pharisees, which were the most holy, and also had the name, that they were God's people, and the church, which also did their sacrifice: ye are of your father the devil." ††)

Suppose, then, that some one should call the forgiveness of sins regeneration, and not the gift of faith; - and there have been orthodox teachers who have spoken thus ‡) - would that change the state of the case even by a hair's breadth? Certainly not! for one cannot keep the forgiveness of sins like a hat on one's head, no matter what happens under it. But as long as we believe, we are forgiven and justified. As soon as our faith ceases, we can no longer be called justified or born again in this sense. What, then, troubles the author, that he should pour into our shoes an enmity against this most innocent use of language (justification - regeneration)?

But to give himself the appearance of proof, he cites two passages which he claims to have found in the negotiations of our northern district. Without a doubt the most convincing; because the Mr. Recensent is really not in the mood to give us anything. And what are these passages? Here is one: Brobst, page 200: "The regeneration is represented as nothing more than a new relation of the baptized to God brought about by baptism, as an inexplicable something wrought in the soul by baptism, which is not lost even if the man falls into mortal sins." And this opinion was rejected in Milwaukee. But the Lord Recensent, by his great

*) Apologia, Mueller 144.

Brennglas have noticed that the pastors in question have thus discarded an article of the Formula of Concord. O wonder upon wonder! On which page of Müller's edition does the Concordia formula teach that regeneration remains for mortal sinners? For that alone, quite alone, is what is at issue here! Not at all about whether regeneration is a relation! But solely, quite solely, whether regeneration is such a relationship, which remains, even if man falls into mortal sin. Dear Mr. Recensent, have the goodness to direct your glass also to these last ten words! For they contain just the state of the question, no more and no less! But you act as if they were not there at all. And then you make a noise about the heresy, not that we have said, but that you have artificially carved out of our words.

The second sentence of our protocol, which you would so readily like to find in contradiction with the Concordia formula, reads thus: "It is asserted that one who is born again through baptism always remains such. But according to the Scriptures we must believe that in regeneration not only man's relation to God, but his heart, mind, courage, and all his powers are changed." *) Thus our poor pastors are said to have thrown the old Lutheran version of regeneration as a change of relationship to God into the dustbin of error! Now I ask any one who is accustomed to see, not through recensor's glasses, but with his own eyes,-where then is the silliness that is here tied on the tongues of the men of Milwaukee? Where on earth did they say that the new birth is not a change in our relation to God? Are "not merely" and "not" really one and the same? Hitherto we had believed it to be the very opposite. - I say, for example: This man is not merely a highly learned professor, but also a great church politician. And thus I am supposed to have denied that he is a professor at all! Dear Mr. Reviewer, how would it be if in the future you would always take a closer look at the particles (in German, verbuugswörtern) in the text before you put the heretic's cap on some poor worm of a pastor? And if you were really too busy to pay too much attention to such trifles, as conjunctions certainly are, - did you not read the prefix? The remark that "the new birth is not merely a change in our relation to God" was made in Milwaukee only to prove the main proposition, "that he who is born again through baptism does not always remain such. Read up on it! †) And

*) Negotiations 20, Brobst 200.
†) Negotiations, page 20, lines 20-23.'

Some remarks on the doctrine of regeneration. 277 Now you see, Professor, how extraordinarily simple was the train of thought of our poor pastors. They said to themselves: The opinion of the Germans that every baptized person remains a born-again person *nolens volens* until death is false, because the new birth is not merely something sky-high apart from us, but also something quite tremendous in us (namely, the gift of faith). Where, therefore, faith is evaporated, there also is regeneration evaporated. - So far were our brethren in Milwaukee from denying that regeneration could be used in the sense of justification!

However, there is another error hidden in this evil-sounding new-scientific use of language ("all baptized are born again"). The "Negotiations" say quite correctly (page 20): "We must hold to the doctrine that not all who are baptized are born again, because there are many who resist the Holy Spirit. A Jew who remains in his unbelief, and is baptized only for the sake of the pathen money, is certainly not born again; just as little is he converted who hears the converting word of God, but does not accept it. To the sacraments must by no means be ascribed a magical power, an effect without faith *ex opere operato.*" -

Even less than all this did the remarks of the Milwaukians on the relation of justification to regeneration find the applause of our reviewer. And yet our friends had done nothing but confess with all simple-minded Christians: "Rebirth and faith and justification coincide in time. But if one wants to separate them conceptually [not "conceptually," as the review says on the 203rd page, probably through a typographical error]; well, one must declare: first God gives faith-and that is regeneration; then we believe; and then we are justified. Just as if I said: first the electric spark is produced, then it goes through the wire, and then it brings me the dispatch. And yet all three happen in one and the same second.

And what does our Lord Recensent do? Hear and marvel! He makes the first (the gift of faith) disappear, and puts a changeling (the renewal) in its place. And no sooner is the substitution quietly, quietly accomplished, than he begins to cry out, "Oh, about these Missourians! they put regeneration before justification! overthrow the whole order of salvation! And this wants to be Lutheran! *O tempora, o mores*!

What's the matter with you, Mr. Recensent? What are you crying about?

What am I crying about? Well, don't you see? These Missourians, whom we thought were orthodox, are violating the very foundation of the Glaup! [Brobst, page 210.] Put sanctification before justification!

Take comfort, Theuerster, take comfort! It is an optical illusion. You have indeed confused the persons. Not the Missourians, no you, you yourself have put renewal before justification! No one else! The poor Milvaukians only said: First the gift of faith, then justification. Then you came along, escaped the peach (the gift of faith), and put a bar of soap in its place. And now you lament so heartbreakingly about the soap! Take the soap away and put it in your pocket, that's where it came from. And then put the peach back. You must have hidden it somewhere, you little rascal!

But stop! It seems that you are making serious efforts to prove to us that peach and soap are the same thing, - identical, the learned gentlemen in Germany would say. For the Milwaukians had remarked a few lines before: according to the Holy Scriptures, one must believe that in regeneration not only man's relationship to God, but his heart, mind, courage, and all his powers are changed. Now you think that this proves that by regeneration they understood nothing else than sanctification. Granted, then, that sanctification is also such a change, does it really follow that the Milvaukians meant just that? Just sanctification, and not the gift of faith? Must I mean a humming-bird when I say bird? Just because the hummingbird is also a bird? Can it not also be a raven or a turkey? For - quite confidently - the faith that God gives is, after all, in the proper sense a change of heart. For when a heathen believes, God gives him a different heart, a different mind, a different courage, and new strength, does he not? If, then, the Milvaukians called the new birth a change of heart and of all its powers, was it at least possible that they understood it to mean nothing else than the gift of faith? But at least possible? And what if they had said so explicitly a page and a half further on? If they had expressly said that by the new birth they understood just this and nothing else? Just read page 21, lines 36 and 37.

So I'm talking about a flower. You think I mean a rose. Then I'll explain: I don't mean a rose, I mean a lily. And you still think I meant a rose!

Now then, lest you should say that we have lacked due clearness, hear it again: "We understand by regeneration the gift of faith." In this sense, and in this sense only, we place it conceptually before justification. If others wish to speak of regeneration in another sense, let them do so. We do not make any

Heresy. Only, in this case, they should refrain from putting regeneration before justification! Do you hear me? Surely, however, regeneration belongs after justification, if regeneration or sanctification is to be called by it. I think that is clear. -

Well, we are done. Hopefully, this explanation of ours will have calmed the dear Mr. Recensenten somewhat. We are also happy to send him our treatises on request, always eight days earlier than other people, so that he has time to read them through quite carefully. Because - no offense - but this time he has been a little too hasty.

(Submitted.)

A document from the Middle Ages.

The following poem was found in Heilsberg in Old Prussia. It was used there towards the end of the Middle Ages to sharpen the conscience of the knights of the order who sat on the bench. At the same time it shows how little one was inclined at that time within the borders of the Order's territory to worship the Roman Pope as an earthly god:

Judicabit judices judex generalis, Ibi nihil proderit dignitas papalis. Sive sit episcopus, sive cardinalis; Reus condemnabitur, nec quaeretur qualis.

Ibi nihil proderit quidquam applicare, Neque quid excipere, neque replicare, Nec ad apostolicam sedem adpellare, Neque codicillos Caesaris citare.
Reus condemnabitur, nec dicetur: quare.

Cogitate miseri, qui et quales estis!
Quid in hoc judicio dicere potestis!
Ibi nulli codici locus nec digestis;
Illic idem dominus judex actor testis.

Judge the judges of all things;
If the pope is a culprit, it's: he pays for it! Nothing avails the bishop's high hat, nor the Cardinal's. God damn the guilty, ask not: ***quid*** and ***qualis***? It will be of no use, if you want to give evidence there, If you want to evade or replicate there, Nor appeal to the apostolic see, Nor cite the emperor's modern statutes. - God damn the guilty without quarrel.

Wretches, you should ask yourselves what you are;
What, when the judgment shall come, ye may say! No book of law, no paper, shall be looked up there; There the LORD shall at once judge, and testify, and complain.

Literary Intelligences.

Judgment on the booklet: "The Right Form of a Local Lutheran Church Independent of the State" etc. from Norway. Our dear Norwegian brethren, who in their untiring zeal for the building up of the Lutheran Church among our many Scandinavian brethren in faith here have also translated the "Altenburger Bibelwerk" into Norwegian and have already begun to publish it in print, have also published "Die rechte Gestalt" etc. in Norwegian as early as 1867. In the "Luthersk Kirketidende," which is published in Christiania and has Professor Johnson as its editor, the following advertisement and recommendation is found: "At a time like ours, when the question of the constitution of the church seems to be pressing more and more for examination and possible conclusion, a writing such as this, from a country where there is a Lutheran church independent of the state, and by a man whose daily occupation it is to defend this church with all the weapons of truth and love, deserves to be known among us. It is to be deplored that the literary connection between America and Norway is so slight that it is regarded as almost nothing, and that we have become accustomed, as seems to be the case on the whole, to regard Norwegian literary products that come to us from America with little favor. For this reason, I am doubly pleased that, through the kindness of a respected brother from over there, I have been able to draw the attention of my fellow countrymen to this book. According to the preface of the author, it was originally prepared as a paper for a meeting of the Western District of the Missouri Synod in 1862, and was thus intended to serve as a basis for discussions, but the Synod has decided to publish it nevertheless in this, its less completed form. The writing is intended to prove that the doctrine which the author established in an earlier work on the proper form of a Particular Church independent of the State does not in any way lead to anarchic, ochlocratic, Anabaptist, independent conditions, but rather forms the firmest foundation on which such a church can build itself in its proper form. This is proved in the most convincing manner, in that the Scriptures contain testimonies of old orthodox fathers of our church, who, although they lived in a state church under a consistorial constitution, nevertheless, on the basis of the doctrine which they held of church, office, church government, etc., did not conceive of the form of a local church independent of the state in any other way than that which is set forth here. In order to give a clearer idea of the questions which are answered in this writing from our old teachers, we want to

here the contents of the book. It is divided into three chapters. After some introductory remarks, Cap. 1. sets forth the rights of a local Lutheran congregation independent of the state, Cap. 2. its duties, and Cap. 3. the interpretation of its rights and duties, a. in congregational meetings, b. the care of the congregation that the word of God may dwell and flourish among it abundantly, c. its care for the purity of doctrine and of life, and that in both respects discipline be exercised in its members, d. its duty to take care of its members also in regard to earthly things, e. its care that all things be done in an orderly manner in it, and f. its care that all things be done in an orderly manner in it. Their duty, also with the orthodox church outside of them, to strive for unity of spirit in the bonds of love and peace. g. Their duty to help in their work so that the church as a whole may be built up and promoted. The Fathers, whose words are cited here in Norwegian translation, are - of course next to Luther and the various writings of the Concordia Book - Arcularius, Balduin, Brenz, Brochmand, Calov, Carpzov, Chemnitz, Chyträus, Dannhauer, Dedekennus, Deyling, Flacius, Franz, Fröschel, J. Gerhard, Hartmann, Heshus, Hülsemann, Jonas, Leyser, Mathesius, Melanchthon, Quenstedt, Scriver, and others. A. I trust that the above, especially these names, will be sufficient vouchers for what this writing offers. If one adds that the book is arranged in such a way that it is always preceded by a short, concise paragraph, which is then illuminated point by point with complete quotations from the writings of those fathers, so that the overview is very easy to grasp and retain, and one can also find one's way through the individual matters with great ease, then I believe I have said enough to recommend this work as very meritorious and valuable. I wish that quite a number of people would use this guide in order to acquire a knowledge of the views of our old fathers on the important circumstances and things that are treated here in the easiest possible way" .

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The "***Evangelical Lutheran"*** But the Lutheran Church of America, especially of the South. In the July 15 issue of this newspaper, we read the following: "The southern part of the Lutheran Church is in a special situation and must gradually be drawn toward great changes that will favor a future unification with the other parts. For the present, the preservation of the Southern General Synod is an absolute necessity. Should violent steps be taken to unite it either with the ***General Council*** or with the old General Synod, a general fragmentation of our Southern Lutheran Church would result.

Church would be the consequence. One part would join the ***Council***, another the General Synod, and still a third part would refuse to go with either of the two organizations mentioned, and after remaining for a time to itself, would become despondent and merge with other denominations. The time for such a union has not yet come, but may the changes now going on have such a happy success. Signs of encouragement and hope can be seen everywhere. But let each organization work earnestly in its own circle until the day of union dawns. The relative duties of the various Lutheran bodies are mainly as follows: The Southern General Synod provides for the Lutherans of the South and Southwest; the Old General Synod for the English Lutherans of the North and West; the ***General Council for*** the native American-German population together with a few English and some immigrant Germans; the Missouri Synod and the General Synod of Ohio provide for our immigrants. These are the great Lutheran bodies of America, and in the writer's opinion the destruction of the peculiar character of any one of them would inflict a terrible wound upon the Church. " C.

For the Knowledge of General Synodal Lutheranism. In No. 30 of the Lutheran Church Friend is found the model of a Lutheran congregational order according to General Synodalist terms. Characteristic among the eilf "Articles of Organization" of this Discipline are Articles 3 and 8. The third article is intended to indicate the doctrinal basis. It reads: "In order to distinguish ourselves among the various branches of the Christian Church, we call ourselves Evangelical Lutherans, accept and hold, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the Word of God, as contained in the canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments, as the sole, infallible guide of faith and life, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exposition of the essential doctrines of the divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded on that Word. We also adopt 'Luther's Small Catechism' as the manual to be used in teaching religion to our youth." The eighth article of the preacher reads thus: "1. The congregation shall have a preacher whose pastorate is ecclesiastically recognized, who wholeheartedly embraces the doctrinal basis as stated in Article 3 of this Constitution, who ---------- is a member of the ---------- Synod or of any synod in connection with the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America. 2. he shall be chosen by a majority vote of the members present at a regular meeting, publicly called and duly advertised for that purpose, and shall remain until either he or the congregation shall desire to dissolve the connection, notice of which must be given to the party concerned three months beforehand." - These are, however, true model articles of the well-known General Synodalist unconscientiousness. Poor, three times beaten and deceived congregation, which, on the basis of this Lutheran-titled work of art, must be either a conglomerate of friend and foe of the one and pure confession, or a stomping ground of all kinds of false spirits, or a temporary boarding house of shameless hirelings - or all three together! R.

In Chicago a conference of evangelically minded preachers and members of the Episcopal Church gathered to protest against the rampant high churchism. Very sharp speeches were held and there was also talk of improving the liturgy, mainly because the approved liturgy in the baptismal form seems to teach that one is born again through baptism.

The classes in Holland and Wisconsin complained of Freemasonry, and petitioned the Synod that it should express its disapproval of all church members connected with the order, and if they would not leave it, that there should be an expulsion of them from the church.

(Reform. Kirchenzeitung.)

The American branch of the Evangelical Alliance has sent Dr. Schaff to Europe to make contact with the most prominent theologians and members of the Alliance and to find out how many and which of them will participate in the Alliance meeting to be held in New York in the late year of 1870. So far he has had the best success, and secured the participation, among other famous men, of Dr. Van Oosterzen, the Dutch Lange, as he has already been called.

(Apologet.)

II. From land.

The Papist Concilium has been discussed for some time in all kinds of ecclesiastical and political journals, and is the subject of fierce attacks not only from the Protestant but also from the Catholic side. Under the title: "The Concilium and the Civilta" there is a series of articles in the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, which were immediately confiscated in Rome and translated into French in Paris. The ultramontane and Jesuit party names Dr. Dollinger, the well-known provost of Munich, as the author of these articles, and has taken care to have an investigation instituted against him. (According to another news item, by the way, Dollinger's authorship is decisively denied). Especially interesting is the conclusion of the fifth article, which is regarded as the crown of the whole. According to the "ref. K. Z." it reads: "For many centuries, and long before the Reformation, mistrust and disrespect have been the fate of the Germans at the hands of the ruling Roman oligarchy. They were always only the ***contribuens plebs***; the systematic exclusion of the Germans for centuries aroused even the astonishment of the Romans, so that Spanish jurists, e.g. Antonio Gomez, thought that it was done "so that the secrets of the Church would not be revealed to the Emperor. Later, a German count or prince received the red hat here and there, but never a man of intellectual importance, and until recent times, with the exception of Cusa, who became indispensable under Eugene IV, and Schomberg under Clement VII, no German has ever been admitted to take part in the more important business of the Curia. If one looks through the list of all members of the Index Congregation printed in some editions of the Index, one finds that among these hundreds there has not been a single German theologian during three centuries, with the exception of a few monks who happened to live in Roman monasteries. This, however, has not prevented this Congregation from condemning German books to its heart's content. And as it is on earth, so it seems to be in heaven; Spain, Italy, South America, France supply the papal Congregation for the Canonization with a multitude of candidates; but there, too, the Germans are the Cinderellas of the nations. Only the Jesuits, who know how to make the impossible possible and the unbelievable believable, have finally succeeded in getting one of their own (Canisius), despite his flaw of German birth, into the Calendar of Saints. Incidentally, in six centuries, Bishop Benno of Meissen was the only one to whom this honor was bestowed (1523), and it only happened to him because of his devotion to the Gregorian system. - No one will speak for Germany, for the 25 million Catholic Germans, at this Council. Who would dare to do so, or whom

would they be allowed to finish speaking? Who would stand before this assembly, at least two-thirds of which consisted of Romans, and say: "I warn you, do not pass resolutions that the German spirit cannot bear. Consider that the entire educated ruling middle class, that the entire thinking lay world in Germany received its education at German universities. The Germans are no longer that patient people which for centuries allowed itself to be burdened by Rome, to be mistreated in its deepest feelings and aspirations, to have its most just demands rejected or evaded, until at last in 1517 the camel's back broke. You still have millions of Catholic Germans; but these millions are everywhere permeated by Protestant elements, live spiritually on Protestant, at any rate not on ultramontane literature, are under the daily influence of an unrestrainedly free daily press, and mere shame would keep them from professing papal infallibility-to a doctrine which is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to the old Church, to history, and to the Church itself. The doctrine makes a mockery of Holy Scripture, of the ancient Church, of history, of human reason. - Do not give yourselves up to the pernicious illusion of taking a crowd of Jesuits and Jesuit pupils, who have been alienated from their fatherland by Roman education and have lost the understanding of the German spirit, for the right interpreters of the German way of thinking and spiritual direction! You may well force the German theologians by episcopal terrorism, by indexes and depositions, etc., to bend their necks silently under the Caudinian yoke of the new article of faith you have created, but you will get no further. The German theologians, even the next generation, will in the end still remain German in feeling, in thinking, and in reasoning, and so long as there is a logic and a history in Germany, they will say, inwardly at least, "this infallibility is a delusion, a fantasy." They will say it even when all the chairs, not only the two in Vienna, are occupied by Italian Dominicans and Jesuits. - When Leo X. had achieved the abolition of the pragmatic Sanction and with it the abolition of the reformatory Canons of Constance and Basle in France, when he had the fullest dominion of the Pope over all Concilia and his supremacy over all kingdoms and monarchs proclaimed in 1517 by his Italian Pocket Council, the so-called fifth Lateran, then the Curia revelled in rapture, the whole city celebrated the event by illumination, the highest stage of power and glory seemed to have been reached, the whole Christian world laid at the Pope's feet and made tributary. A few months later a German professor pinned a few theses to the gates of the church at Wittenberg, - ten years later Rome with her treasures extorted from the whole world became the prey of German mercenaries, and forty years later half the world, the most powerful nations were irretrievably separated from Rome. This time, if the Concilium can be used to wrap the wreath of infallibility around the Pope's temple, none of the things that happened in the wake of the fifth Lateran Synod will happen. No sudden great apostasy will occur, no open revolt in the grand style will show itself; all will remain quiet, all too quiet. The Jesuits and their disciples will sing their hosannah, draw some consequences, and endeavor to exploit the new dogma to the best of their ability, - and the world will let them. But a thorough-going revulsion against the insatiable Italian priesthood, which is always reaching further, will take hold of the spirits more and more. Deeper and deeper will the indignation over such immoderate impositions bore into the souls of men. - Even the human capacity for faith has its limits, and Tertullian's words, "I believe because it is absurd," no longer resonate in modern Europe. For in this the human spirit resembles the body, that when its

The first thing to be said about this is that, if too much and too strange things are expected of the digestive power, disgust and vomiting will also occur in him. Niebuhr once remarked in Rome: It is no wonder that so many Italians are atheists; the Roman Curia makes them believe things (e.g., the arbitrary release of souls from purgatory by means of papal indulgences and privileged altars) that they cannot possibly believe, and so they throw away everything else. This will also be the success of the new article of faith on infallibility. A strong, far-reaching and deep-reaching diminution of religious faith in the Catholic nations will be the next and lasting effect. The opponents in and outside the Church, who now dominate the literature in almost all Catholic countries, will point with scorn and triumph to this latest invention of a Synod indulging the desires of Curia at the expense of ecclesiastical tradition, and will say: "As a side piece to the old Robber Synod of 449, we now have a flatterer's Synod of 1869.

Spain. In the Cortes, very strong voices are being raised in favor of the freedom of the Gospel against those who want to see the sole rule of the Roman Church continued. In the N. E. K.-Z. we find the following interesting report. - Canonicus Manterola had undertaken to defend the government's bill, according to which the Catholic Church should be the national church maintained and preferred by the state, and every other confession only tolerated. Sennor Castelar, on the other hand, plaidir for the freedom of the Church from the State, and with a magnificent eloquence expounded this principle in all its breadth and height. "Our statesmen," said he, "do not believe in the Catholic Church, but they pay it as an element of order, unfortunately without the guarantee of success. For they will not, after all, obtain by dower the right to superintend the Church; and there is no peace until Church and State are entirely separated from each other. In the name of the religion of love, in the name of religion, I demand religious equality." - In this speech Castelar, in order to show the danger of Catholicism to the State, had adduced a great number of historical facts which the Canonicus Manterola doubted as untrue. The defender of the Roman Church had taken on a heavy burden and made things easy for his opponent. Castelar promised to produce the documents, and did so at the session of April 14. He proved to the evidence that Gregory XIII. had expressed his exultation over Bartholomew's Night before the assembled Cardinals. He read a letter in which Innocent III had addressed to the Archbishop of Sens the words, "the Jews are a people condemned to eternal slavery." He had further alleged that Pius V had participated in the attempted assassination of Queen Elizabeth of England. Manterola had denied this; one can imagine the silence and astonishment of the assembly when Castelar opened the second volume of the Correspondence of Philip II. published by Gayard and read from it a few pages on which it is clearly stated that Pius V. sent the envoy Ridolfi to the King to speak with him about an enterprise which was of the greatest importance for God and the Christian nations; for the success of this enterprise the King should procure all means, because it was for the glory of God. This enterprise is the murder of Queen Elizabeth, a plan the details of which the Envoy sets forth first before the King, then in the full Council of State. The Grand Inquisitor deems it necessary to support the enterprise and to declare that one acts in authority of the Pope; the Duke of Feria proposes to hand over the done throne to the Queen of Scotland. The Nuncio declares the enterprise to be very easy; the King communicates the plan to the Duke of Alba and writes in his letters,

that it was about the murder of the Queen, "His Holiness offers her assistance to serve God and the best of the Church, and is ready to put the chalices of the Church and even her own vestments to the deed." Castelar read this without adding a word; and Manterola could not but declare this correspondence genuine. Annihilated, the advocate of ultramontanism stood before the house which for centuries had not heard such language, had not been allowed to read such documents.

From the "Apologist" we learn the following:

The Cortes, by 163 votes to 40, added the following paragraph as an amendment to the constitutional paragraph in which the nation undertakes to maintain the Catholic cult and the Catholic priests, and thus to recognize the Roman Catholic religion as the state religion: "The public or private practice of another cult shall be guaranteed to all foreigners residing in Spain, without any other restrictions than those which general morality and common law determine. If any Spaniard professes a religion other than the Catholic, the above is applicable to him also." About this new unexpected edict of tolerance the clerical party and its press are naturally extremely upset. A Madrid paper wrote: "It seems a dream, a terrible dream; but it is the appalling truth. The Catholic religion has ceased to be official." And a Madrid priest, at the close of his sermon, exclaimed, "Death to the Protestants, the heretics, who have voted for religious liberty!" The Minister of Justice, however, had the "madman" arrested, and reported this to the Cortes. - Very characteristic, by the way, of the spirit out of which the above toleration paragraph is born, and which seems to pervade the whole recent antipapist movement in Spain, are also the speeches of the patriot and famous orator Sennor de Castelar, before the Cortes, the last of which secured even the negotiations on the church question the success mentioned. It is said in this, among other things: "Never.need anyone fear that I will make new proposals on this sublime problem" (the Church Question, namely) "for the boundaries between philosophy and legislation are well known to me. Outside this place in the colleges, we are entitled to speak about the various dogmas and to measure their value with the independent measure of our reason. Here, in this chamber, it is only for us to speak of the relations of the Church to the State, of religion to politics. ---------- But we must not expect that every new idea will do justice to its predecessor. Christianity did not do this to paganism, and those gods and goddesses of old, as they were immortalized in marble by the hands of the old masters, were nothing more than idols in the eyes of the first Christians. ---------- This side of the Chamber has been accused of prejudice against Catholicism. I will answer you, as I could not do more truly before the judgment seat of God (?!): I am not a divine scholar and hero of faith, but belong to the world of philosophy and reason. But if I ever rose again from death, (!!) I would not turn to Protestantism, whose teachings dry up my soul, heart and conscience, to Protestantism, which is the eternal enemy of my country, its race and history. I would return to the altar that fills my life with the greatest thoughts; I would bend my knees before the holy Virgin, who with her smile appeased my first passions; I would calm my spirit with the vapour of incense, the tones of the organ, and the golden rays of the sun, refracted by brightly-coloured

stained-glass windows, reflected on the wings of the angels who stood at my cradle; and in my hour of death I would seek refuge at that cross which spreads its arms protectively over the place which, above all on earth, I most venerate - my mother's grave. Yes, gentlemen, if I prefer any religion at all, it is Catholicism. But what is Catholicism? I am the truth; make me the preferred religion, for I am the truth'! Do not other religions say the same? I am the truth,' says paganism; it handed Socrates the cup of hemlock, and he died under the derision of the people. I am the truth,' says Judaism, and nailed Christ to the cross. "I am virtue," says Protestantism, and murdered Servet. I am the currency', says Catholicism, and in the name of grace and mercy Spain sank into poverty and ruin. Thus religious intolerance, through the Inquisition, brought thousands to their death."

Baden. The church-political feud is still in full swing. The so-called Catholic People's Party, supported from Rome, is taking an increasingly harsh stand against the so-called national-liberal governing party headed by the Jolly Ministry, holding mass meetings and addressing petition after petition to the Grand Duke for the removal of the ministry and the abolition of the previous electoral law. But so far it seems to be struggling without any success. Here, in fact, two unclean spirits are contending with each other for dominion in the state of Baden: the modern, mischievous unbelief hostile to all positively Christian ecclesiastical manifestations, and the insatiable Roman crook and domineering superstition. The time that follows will now teach which party victory is likely to grant the most profit or loss to the kingdom of God. Under the present circumstances, the dispute between the Pope and the Prince over the reoccupation of the Archbishopric of Freiburg has not yet been settled. The Archbishopric Admiral Dr. Kübel, who was appointed by Rome, is working with Jesuit cunning and consistency for his cause, and the government does not fail to reprimand him to the best of its ability. Some time ago, for example, he excommunicated the mayor of Freiburg, M. Strohmeier, for disobedience to the Church, and was then summoned by the government to appear before the Freiburg District Court at the latter's request. He was acquitted, but later he was publicly ridiculed. - It caused great bitterness among the Catholic population of Baden that, by order of the government, the nunnery of Lindenberg was dissolved and the inmates expelled. R.

Fruits of Puseyism. The Correspondenz de Rome reports from England that a steamboat from London recently landed a small colony of religious at Calais (on the French coast), consisting of ten ladies recently converted to the Catholic faith, who joined the great family of St. Francis three months ago. Franciscus. Pupils of the famous (?) Dr. Pusey, they had for years devoted themselves to works of Christian charity, partly by nursing the sick in the hospitals of London, partly by assisting the poor in their homes. Their love (but not for Christ) led them into the Catholic Church. Their conversion caused a great stir in London. Simultaneously with them about 20 clergymen and other persons of rank entered the Catholic Church, and one counts about 100 conversions due to them. - Since the last 10 years the papal sect in the united kingdom of Great Britain has received an increase of 468 priests, 403 churches, 33 male and 122 female monasteries.

Christoph Hoffmann's Answer to the Pope. The "reformirt Kirchen- Zeitung" reports: "Among the various answers which the pope gave to his Concil-

In the letter received from the Pope, there is also an interesting one dated "Caifa at the foot of Mount Carmel in Palestine, January 1, 1869," with the inscription: "Pius IX the Pope and Roman Bishop wishes Christoph Hoffmann, Elder of the Temple at Jerusalem, all salvation! The epistle is very respectful and affectionate, and the author is pleased that the Pope is also addressing non-Roman Christians, and that he carries the unity of all Christians on his heart, and exhorts them to the serious examination which is so necessary. Next, however, he defends Luther's Reformation as from God, rejects both the proof of the majority and the outward succession of church offices, and points out that even the Roman church no longer has the right gifts of the disciples of the Lord, Matt. 10:8. "Here - says the writer at the close of the Epistle - here lies the cause of the apostasy. For whence would such an aversion to the church and to all that is holy have arisen, as we perceive it to-day both in Catholic and Protestant countries, if men did not 'see' that the church and the veneration of the sanctuaries are of little use to them?" Hence it is no wonder that they have turned to indifference and contempt against God. For it must be confessed, which is certainly not hidden from you, that all churches, especially the Roman Catholic, have become like that servant whom the Lord describes in Luke 12:45, 46. That this second future of the Lord Jesus Christ is near is loudly proclaimed by the signs of our time. Thus the first duty of all Christians, but especially of bishops and teachers, is to prepare themselves and their congregations, so that that day may not overtake them without courage. If Thou, holy Father, wilt use the prestige which God has given Thee to this work, Thou wilt see the unity of Christians, which Thou justly lackest, established in a short time, and many whom the splendor of the papal throne will never be able to win to Thee, led back to JEsu Christo by the humility of Thy confession."

Jewish Mission of the Scottish Church. The Free (Presbyterian) Church in Scotland has expended during the year 1868 the sum of A32, 200 on the Jewish Mission. Its stations are at Amsterdam, Breslau, Constantinople, Prague, Pesth, and Odessa. The reporter on this mission in the General Assembly expresses the following thoughts about it: Thirty years ago we began these missions, and it may easily be the case that thirty years from now there will in fact be an end to all such missions.... The conditions of the Jews have changed tremendously in the last thirty years, more than in the preceding eighteen hundred years. Formerly the great trouble with them was that they were too much oppressed: they could not, of course, love the religion of their oppressors and despots. But now, strangely enough, our missionaries complain that the Jews are so high up, that they have so much freedom, wealth, prestige, and privileges, that they do not want to hear anything about the gospel. This is a new trait in their history, the very opposite of what was seen in them before. (?) They also enjoy a far better education than before and make significant progress everywhere. At the same time they hold together as never before, and even if they do not want to know anything about a central ecclesiastical authority, the striving for a firmer unification is unmistakable. - Edwards, the missionary to the Jews stationed in Breslau, pointed out how in Germany the energy and talents of the Jews are evident in all the grammar schools, and how Jewish young men precede all others. In many important places on the European mainland the daily press is entirely in the hands of the Jews, who thus set the tone for public opinion."

(Lutheran Journal.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 15. October 1869. No. 10.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Research.)

§ 37.

Among the official duties of a preacher with regard to the individual members of his congregation is the care that those who have fallen asleep in the Lord receive a proper, honest and Christian burial. See Match. 14, 12. Acts 8, 2. Match. 26, 12. 13. Tob. 1, 19-21. Is. 53, 9. Jer. 22, 18. 19.

Note 1.

An honest, orderly and Christian-solitary "funeral is when it takes place: during the day, with the ringing of bells (by which the Christian corpse company is called together), with singing, prayer, preaching of divine word (by speech at the grave, so-called "abdication" or "parentation" at the altar, funeral sermon from the pulpit), with blessing, under Christian accompaniment (for example, also with the reading of the curriculum vitae). The sermon consists of singing, prayer, preaching of the divine word (by speech at the grave, so-called abdication or parentation at the altar, funeral sermon from the pulpit, probably also with subsequent reading of the biography), with the blessing, under Christian accompaniment (for example also of the school youth with their teacher under recitation of the Crucifix) and so on. The preacher is guided here by usage and custom. Deyling writes: "The funeral service is conducted according to local custom with chants, bell ringing and other customary ceremonies, in which the pastor may not arbitrarily change anything. In the villages, the preachers are not obliged to go to meet the funeral procession across the third courtyard and to accompany it, if this is not demanded of them in due manner ('*bello modo*', to which Küstner adds by way of explanation: 'i.e. against payment of a certain fee')." (*Institut. prud. past*. Ill, 11, 20.)

Note 2.

As for the difference to be observed in burial with respect to persons, Deyling writes about this: "Although the burial of human corpses does not in itself belong to the sacred, nor to the religious things, nor to the divine service, yet the manner of burial among Christians, which is usually done by singing, preaching, and prayer in public church assembly, constitutes a part of the liturgy and of the public divine service. The way of dealing with corpses was once very different, depending on the differences in the customs of educated and uneducated peoples. It is true that both the Greeks and the Romans at one and the same time used to bury corpses, but this was done less frequently. Much more common was the burning of them. The ancient Christians followed the ancient custom of burying corpses, in accordance with the Scriptures, and had a great abhorrence of burning them. This custom of burial our church rightly follows. For the body that is formed from the earth shall return to the earth after the fall, Genesis 3:19; therefore it is by no means necessary or useful to embalm the corpses, which has been the custom of many Jews and Christians. Burial is divided into honest and dishonest. The latter is either a solemn or a less solemn burial. The former is done publicly, during the day, and with the usual ceremonies. The latter takes place without the usual solemnity, either because of poverty, or because of the air of plague and the danger of infection, or because of self-inflicted melancholy. The mere last will of the deceased, however, is not sufficient for the pastor to omit the customary and solemn funeral ceremonies. The pastor has to take care in every way that the old godly burial ceremonies are not abolished and that the corpses are buried at night without the usual customs, but that the burials are carried out properly in the traditional manner and that in the villages one or the other person from each house joins the funeral procession. For the sake of poverty, no one is to be denied an honest burial; rather, it is proper that the poor as well as the rich be publicly buried with the honest and customary ceremonies. This act of humanity is counted as a work of love and is praised by Christ himself (Matt. 26:12). On the other hand, the refusal of an honest burial is in the nature of a punishment that should not be inflicted on an innocent person. Therefore, the ministers of the church must see to it that the poor, when they have gone out of the world with the praise of piety, receive an honest burial as members of Christ through the generosity of others. Also the

Parish priests and schoolmasters accompany the corpses of the poor free of charge. *) Neither children who have died without baptism, **) nor women who have died during the six weeks, nor those who have died in an accident, or have been murdered, or have been found on the public street or elsewhere, may be excluded from an honest burial. In a doubtful case, however, where it is not evident from certain indications that the deceased had laid hands on himself, the more favorable case shall be assumed ... The dishonest burial is either a human or an ass burial (Jer. 22, 18. 19.). The latter is when the human corpse is buried either outside the graveyard or in a special place on it by the ordinary gravedigger of the dead; but the latter is done by the executioner in an infamous place that is designated for the corpses of animals and criminals, on the Schind-Anger or under the gallows. Such a dishonest and ass burial is not only awarded to malicious suicides, especially when aggravating circumstances are added, but also to those who, convicted of a capital crime or confessed, died in prison before suffering punishment and died unrepentant or self-abducted. †) A dishonest, but human burial,

---

In the Saxon General Articles it is written: "For this purpose the church servants are to be instructed that at the burial of all those who use the Most Holy Sacrament, a short funeral sermon be preached free of charge to the poor and the destitute. Cap. 15.

**In the Saxon General Articles it says: "Because there is also great inequality in the burial of unbaptized children, or those who have lived in their mother's womb but are born dead, some pastors do not accompany them to the burial with their pupils as they do the baptized children, and some do not want to bury them in the places where other Christians are buried; This not only causes great distress to the Christian parents, but often puts the mother, as the weakest instrument, in great jeopardy; and the salvation of Christians is not thus bound to holy baptism, if the Christian mother does not neglect anything in the children, nor is guilty of their untimely death, but by prayer commends them to the Almighty by virtue of his promise, when he said: I am thy God, and of thy seed according to thy seed, that they should therefore be damned: as there were undoubtedly many little children in the Old Testament who died before the eighth day, who were not circumcised, and yet were saved without doubt; of which cause also there is no doubt concerning the salvation of such children, who therefore by faithful prayer besought God: the priests and church servants shall accompany such children to the burial, no less than the others, with Christian ceremonies, according to the custom of each place, and confirm them to the earth with other Christians." Churf. Sächs. Church Order of 1580. fol. 321.

†) Of such cases it is said in a rescript to the churiscan consistories in 1713: "Since the consistories have so little to do with those to whom the *sepultura ecclesiastica is* denied by law, as it is forbidden that the *clerici become* involved in secular affairs and especially the *causas sanguinis* (blood urtheile) do not measure." Deyling op. cit. p. 729.

the "ban on the dead," is conceded to heretics. Thus the corpses of pagans, Turks, Jews, and even of Socinians, who do not belong to the number of Christians, *) may be admitted to our fields of God, which represent the community of true Christians even after death. Those, however, who are of the papal or reformed religion, must not be treated in this manner, nor be excluded from the public places of worship and from the honor of burial. For although the Papists completely exclude Protestants from their places of worship as heretics in violation of the treaty, our churches do not imitate this strictness and do not compare like with like. In Chursachsen, for example, the Roman Catholics and Calvinists are buried in our churchyards, only with the omission of the ceremonies, in silence. **) The same less honorable burial is also granted to the condemned who depart from this life without repentance. For it is established by sacred and ancient canons that we do not hold communion with him with whom we did not hold communion in life, even when he is dead,†) and that those are deprived of an ecclesiastical burial who were previously excluded from ecclesiastical communion. Among these are also those who openly despise the divine word and the sacraments, who are also considered unworthy of a sincere and ecclesiastical burial, if (after such people have been reported, the matter has been thoroughly investigated, and all stages of admonition have been observed) the consistory has so decided ††) and the person in question has remained stiff-necked in contempt of the means of salvation. The pastor's judgment alone, if the person was not interrogated during his life, is not sufficient in a matter of such great importance. Those guilty of a capital crime are subject to the same punishment if they have died in prison with irrefutable evidence, as well as those who have perished in a spring." (*Institut. prud. pastoral*. Ill, 10. § 1-13.)

Some preachers think that in every case they must obey the request to preach a funeral sermon to a deceased person, since this is an opportunity to preach God's Word; but they do not consider that a funeral with Christian ceremonies is a privilege only for those who, according to love, can be believed to have fallen asleep in the Lord, and that despisers of the divine Word who do this up to the time of their death are not allowed to do so.

---

*) Of course, all notorious unbelievers are to be counted as equal to the Socimans.

**) On the difference to be observed here, compare Wittenbergische Consilien, II, 129. and "Lehre u. Wehre" I, 31. f.

†) *"Quibus non communicavimus vivis, iis nec communicamus defunctis.* "

††) The place of the consistory in such a case is taken by the congregation.

who remained after their death, this last honor is not to be given according to God's word. Jer. 22, 18. 19. Matth. 8, 22. It is true that people usually think they are doing enough for their conscience by not mentioning the deceased at all in the funeral sermon, or by mentioning him as an unbeliever; but in so doing they not only commit a self-contradiction, but as a rule do not accomplish their purpose, but the very opposite; Instead of awakening to repentance, one only works bitterness, or the people are so dull-witted that they are satisfied with having procured a Christian, honest burial for the unchristian departed. Compare what Hartmann says about this in his *Pastorale,* p. 1311-61, from Johannes Aepinus' writing: "Grund und Ursachen, warum man die Gottlosen mit geistlichen Gesängen und Ceremonieen nicht soll begraben.

Note 3.

The preacher must indeed use in his funeral sermon the example of true godliness that has publicly shone in the deceased, or the case of an unequivocal conversion in the last hours, but he must be careful not to place himself under suspicion of flattery, partiality, untruthfulness, or even bribery, that he thereby not put himself under suspicion of flattery, partiality, untruthfulness, or even bribery, or create in the people the thought, as if, when the people are now dead, all should be well, whereby irreparable harm is done to the soul. We cannot refrain from sharing here what the zealous Dr. Heinrich Müller writes in his so-called "Erquickungsstunden" under the heading "Leichpredigten - light sermons. It is the following: "Leich-Predigten - light sermons, said that one, because there is a *refrigerium* (refreshment) in it. I wanted to turn it around and say: Light sermons - heavy sermons, for they weigh down hand and bag with gold and silver. O sweet discomfiture, sayest thou. So be it: Light sermons - light sermons! God have mercy! They are light, because they go out of a light mind with many. Is it not light-mindedness for thee to be a liar and a false witness in God's stead, to make light of darkness, virtue of vices, to praise that which is blasphemous, and to set the devil in God's seat? The dead man must be praised, if he had been an excerpt of all the vices in his life; his avarice must be called frugality, his carnal anger a divine zeal, his insolence short-sightedness. He did wrong, thou sayest, he prayed. What dost thou do with that? Thy light preaching maketh light, loose men, who roll about as swine in the filth of sins, relying upon thy light preaching to wipe away all filth. Who would avoid evil when it can be turned into good and bring glory even after death? Believe only that to a faithful servant of Jesus the light sermons are the most difficult sermons. For either one says

The former brings enmity on the back, the latter fear and anxiety on the conscience. I, for my part, would that either none, or all who deserve it, should be preached light sermons. James would have the poor count no less in the church than the rich. But who shall praise the poor after his death? He desires it not, saith thou. Why, my love? Because thine appetite is not satisfied with money. Thou dost lecture money, and not men. Copper money, copper masses of souls... In a word, if there were no miser among the clergy, there would not be so much preaching of lies and lies. They are only due to those who have been a peculiar model and example of mercy and patience, so that others are pointed to them as predecessors and others are encouraged by their examples; as St. Jacob says of Job: "You have heard the patience of Job. The best bell that can be rung after us in death is this, that we may be praised as the centurion praised Christ: "Truly this was a righteous man and the Son of God. In this acclamation, my Christian, let it suffice thee." (Devotion 177.)

Note 4.

The preacher should work towards the congregation acquiring a graveyard for itself, erecting it according to its purpose, and having it well kept. The greater the barbarism of which one is guilty, especially here in regard to burial places, the more zealous Christian congregations should be in keeping holy the places where the bones of those who have fallen asleep in Christ rest and await a resurrection in glory, 2 Kings 23:18. Thus Luther wrote to the mayor of Wittenberg in 1539, when the churchyard was disgraced: "Dear Mr. Mayor, since the abuse of the churchyard is becoming more and more prevalent, that everyone lays, leads, places, and makes it to his liking; so that the dear dead (who have been baptized in Christ and are alive, and are waiting for the resurrection in the churchyard, as resting and sleeping in their mourners, as Isaiah 26. (Cap. 26.) is not much more esteemed than if they were lying on a shingle, or not far from the gallows: so my request is, that you will see to it that such other abuses are done away with, and that a little greater honour and rest may be granted to the dead, of whom there is no doubt that many have fallen asleep in Christ. For we cannot dig them all up and put them away, that we may give way to such abuses; we would do so, if it were possible; otherwise it seems as if we thought nothing of the dead, nor of the resurrection of the dead. We may well suffer the brewing pan, as of old, for safety's sake; but on the other hand it is too much, that even the carpenters respect no sermon, yea, beat and rumble with their stuff, that not a word may be heard in the sermon; thinking it is more needful, and

Cheaper to hear a carpenter's axe than God's word." (XIV, 1362.)

The preacher and the congregation should also see to it that the graven images do not contain anything unscriptural, and no one should be allowed to have such things done without having them examined and approved by suitable persons.

Note 5.

Seidel makes the following remark, which should also be taken into account here: "Because there are examples of some persons who have lain in severe unconsciousness and were thought to be dead, but then came to themselves again, and because it is generally indecent to proceed with the burial too quickly, the preacher is obligated to see that a sufficient time is allowed between the death and the burial. (Pastoraltheol. I, 23, 5.)

(To be continued.)

(For the "Doctrine and Defense.")

The four kingdoms of Daniel.

Daniel Cap. 2. u. 7.

2. the Medopersian Empire.

Let us now proceed to the second of the symbolized kingdoms, which, according to the ecclesiastical interpretation, is the Median, and is thus described: "His breast and his arms were of silver" (Dan. 2:32). "And, behold, the other beast afterward was like a lion, and stood on one side, and had in his mouth under his teeth three great long teeth. And it was said unto him, Arise, and eat much flesh" (Dan. 7:5.).

The chest and arms of the great statue that Nebuchadnezzar saw in a dream were of silver. This new metal signifies a double thing: a kingdom different from the first, symbolized by gold, and indeed inferior, as silver is a different and inferior metal to gold. Thus Daniel himself interprets it Cap. 2, 39: "After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thine." This, according to the ecclesiastical interpretation, is the Medo-Persian kingdom. - Media was early dependent on the ancient Assyrian kings, but became free under Arbanes in 888 B.C., and an independent empire, to which the ancestral land of the Persians and the Zand people were subject. While Dejoces ruled over the Medes, the Persians lived in independence. But already his son Phraortes brought them back into a kind of dependence on Media. Under his son and successor, Kyaxares I., the Medes and Persians overthrew each other as the

Allies of Nabopolassar the, New Assyrian empire 625 B.C. Kyaxares I was followed by Astyages, under whom soft prince the Persians, led by Cyrus, made a revolt and defeated the Medes at Pasargada 560 B.C.. Cyrus got Astyages into his hands and kept him with him. Thus the Medrian empire was overthrown, and the Medo-Persian founded, in which the Median and still more the Persian people ruled. If the above date is correct, the word "after thee" (Dan. 2, 39.) was very exactly fulfilled, in that Nebuchadnezzar died in 561 B.C., and Cyrus conquered the Medes in 500 B.C.. In this, too, may be seen a piece of the fulfillment, that as the silver breast had two silver arms, so in this empire were two principal nations, the Medes and the Persians. At least this is how Vulture and Calov understand it, although newer commentators do not want to give the two arms any special significance. But why are the arms mentioned, since they could just as well be thought of as belonging to the breast as the hands, which are not mentioned, could be thought of as belonging to the arms with their fingers? These had no meaning, so they are not mentioned; should not the arms, which are expressly mentioned, mean something, namely, two main peoples through whom the empire performed its deeds? Otherwise, the arm is often used in Scripture as an image of power. Cf. 2 Chron. 32, 8. Jer. 17, 5. 48,5. Luc. 1, 51.

Now it is said of this second empire that it was "smaller" than the first, which our old commentators interpret partly from the shorter existence of this second empire (they count to the Chaldean Babylonian empire also the Old and New Assyrian and thus attribute to the first empire a duration of about 1500, to the second only of 330-240 years), partly from its constant wars, its frequent defeats, the violent death of its rulers and finally the decay brought about and promoted by all this. Hengstenberg says: "Notwithstanding its great extent, the Persian empire very soon fell into an inner rottenness, which led it towards its downfall". Schlosser shows that with all the flourishing of the Persian empire there was neither science, nor true art, nor genuine human education, nor strength against internal and external enemies," that "rather, with the old simplicity of manners, all that was noble and good was irrevocably lost." "Later history shows us always one satrap against another, one restraining the most useful measures of the other, and the king being only a sacred name which, as once in the empire of the Great Mogul and now in the Turkish, deceives the people. The throne at Susa is a sham which no satrap can dispense with. - As for Persian warfare, nothing can be thought sadder than the later imperial armies." Hengstenberg, citing these words of Schlosser, adds, "Hardly would an army, like that of Alexander, which threw the Persian monarchy over with so easy an effort, have

have overpowered Babylon's, although by the time of her fall she had lost much of the greatness she possessed in Nebuchadnezzar's time."

Let us now proceed to what we read of this kingdom in chapter 7. It appears under the image of a bear. The bear is slower and clumsier than the lion, nor so clever and fearless as the latter, yet brave, cruel, and very voracious. Because of his cruelty he is often called next to the lion, Prov. 28, 15. Amos 5, 19. Klagel. 3, 10. he is especially cruel when he has lost his young, Prov. 17, 12. Hos. 13, 8. Amos 5, 19. he is the image of a tyrant, Prov. 28, 15. or else of an angry and cruel man, 2 Sam. 17, 8. as well as of God in his anger, Klagel. 3, 10. Hos. 13, 8.

How far will the Medean empire symbolized by a bear remind our Lutheran fathers that, as the bear is in many ways inferior to the lion, this second empire is "inferior" to the first. At the same time, however, it is also a brave and very cruel kingdom, which qualities are found in the bear. But not only this, also the voracity and the clumsy nature of the bear finds its analogue in the Medopersian kingdom.

The Medo-Persian Empire was very voracious, that is, addicted to conquest. Von Lengerke says: "No empire or power could prevent the conquering designs of the Persian empire." After Cyrus had defeated the Medes at Pasargadae, and had got their king into his power, he turned on King Croesus of Lydia, who was himself considered the richest king in Asia, as his empire was the most powerful and flourishing. After an undecided battle at Pteria, Cyrus defeated Crœsus at Sardis, and smitten the Lydian. Empire to his dominion, whereupon he also subdued the Carian and Greek coastal cities. Hereupon Cyrus would undoubtedly also have made war on Media, had not the desire to be able to count this country to his empire also been attainable in a peaceful way. Kyarares II. namely, the son of the king of Media, who had been overcome by Cyrus, had sought to maintain himself in power. But as he had no sons to succeed him in the dominion, Cyrus left him in possession of Media, married its daughter or sister, and united with him against Babylon, which was conquered thereupon in 536 B.C. Cyrus now transferred his reign to Babylon. Cyrus now transferred his seat of government to Babylon, but left the rule to Kyaxares II (who is called "Darms of the Medes" in Dau. 5, 31). After the latter's death, which soon followed, Cyrus assumed sole rule, and made a campaign against the Massagetes, whose queen Tomyris had rejected his proposal for her hand, because she probably saw through his intention to seize her country. When he lost his life on this campaign, in 529 B.C., he was succeeded by his son Cambyses. The latter probably dropped his father's northern enterprise, but instead turned his conquering eyes to Egypt, which he made the Persian province of

whereupon he planned to conquer not only Upper Egypt and the temple state of Ammonium, but also Ethiopia. When this plan failed, he would have liked to make a move against Carthage, but the Tyrians refused him the necessary ships. After his successor Darius Hystaspis had fought a number of counter-kings and the rising Babylon and had established order in the empire, he was also driven to expand the empire in the spirit of his founder. He first undertook a campaign against the Scythians, whom he finally subdued through his commander Megabyzus. He then turned his gaze eastward and extended his dominion to the Indus. He was not so fortunate, on the other hand, in his attempt to subjugate the Cyrenean northern coast of Africa, as well as in his two campaigns against Greece. After he had died over the armaments for a third campaign, his son Xerxes set out with a large army to subjugate Greece, though in vain. The next rulers confined themselves more to maintaining the empire, which was disintegrating more and more. The old strength had disappeared, so that the greed for countries did not manifest itself so strongly.

Nor can bravery be denied to the Persians, as may be inferred from the fact that they had not only the desire to conquer great countries, but also the courage and strength to carry out their great plans. Even in later times, when Persia's battles with Greece began, bravery had not yet completely disappeared. It was still displayed at Salamis, at Platää, at Granikus, at Jssus, and at Gaugamela and Arbela.

It was not exactly the lack of bravery, but more a clumsy foolishness, a false confidence in the great masses, which caused the Persian empire its great defeats in the battles with Greece and Macedonia. Thus the folly of the Persians, who allowed themselves to be led astray by an elevator of Themistocles to the naval battle at Salamis, and the clumsiness of the fleet of a thousand ships, which hindered itself in the straits, was a cause of the great Persian defeat there. - When Darms set out against Alexander, he carried with him an army of 400,000, according to others even of 600,000 men. But instead of awaiting his Macedonian adversary in the wide plain of Onchaea, where the hundreds of thousands of his proud army of peoples had full room to unfold, and where especially the great Persian cavalry force of about 100,000 men, as well as the multitude of light infantry, no obstacle stood in the way of their peculiar mode of attack, Darius, against the advice of some understanding Greeks, left this so exceedingly favourable position and marched to Cilicia, where in the narrow beach plain on the river Pinarus, in the vicinity of Zssus, the battle took place, in which Alexander

with his small army of about 35,000 men, including 5000 horsemen, won a complete victory.

Finally, the Persians were also a wild and cruel people. Even the otherwise "humane and noble" Cyrus revealed this character of the empire when, after defeating King Croesus, he had a funeral pyre built to burn him and fourteen young Lydians with him. - When Babylon was taken, the conquerors entered the royal palace, and cut down king Belshazzar with all his great men. - If, on the other hand, the story is true that Tomyris, the queen of the Massagetes, put Cyrus' head into a tube filled with blood, that he might be satisfied in it, it is likewise a testimony to the cruelty of the Mede-Persian empire. - This character, at any rate, cannot be denied under Cyrus' successor Cambyses. It was in no small measure a desire for revenge that directed his conquering eye to Egypt, for the king Amasis had offended him. When he took Egypt, Amasis had already died, but Cambyses still sought revenge and had his corpse, which was resting in Sais, reviled. - Because the mercenaries of the Egyptian king of that time, Psammenit, had murdered a Persian herald and his escort against all international law, he raged terribly against the defeated. Thus 2000 noble virgins, with the king's daughter at their head, dressed as slaves and carrying water jugs, had to pass before their fathers to fetch water by the slaves. Then 2000 noble boys of the same age, among them Psammenit's son, with ropes around their necks and bridles in their mouths, passed by and were led to their deaths. Psammenit himself, who proved ungrateful and disloyal to Cambyses, was also killed later by drinking the blood of bulls. - On the unfortunate march against Ethiopia led by Cambyses himself, the army ran out of food, but they helped themselves by loosely slaughtering and eating the tenth man. When Cambyses returned to Memphis from this campaign, the Egyptians were celebrating a great religious festival. But as he thought that they were rejoicing over his misfortune, he immediately had the rulers of the city executed, notwithstanding their declaration to him, and he himself thrust a dagger into the hip of Apis, about whose final attainment the festival was celebrated, so that he died, and he had the priests scourged and all the immediate participants in the festival put to death. In general, as long as he was in Egypt, he did not cease to mock the Egyptian worship by desecrating temples, burning images, opening coffins, and committing similar acts of impiety. Even on his own Persians he vented his despotic arrogance. Thus he had his brother Smerdis killed, maltreated his own wife to death, let twelve noble Persians live-

dig buried, and when Prexaspes told him that the Persians thought he was mad from drunkenness, he wished to give proof of his sanity by shooting through the heart with an arrow the son of the same, who stood afar off. - After his successor Darius Hystaspis had quelled the outrage of Babylon, he had 3000 of the most distinguished inhabitants crucified. - When, in his march against the Scythians, he had allowed himself to be lured too deeply into the interior of the country, he secretly turned back by night, and with the camp abandoned his most infirm crew to the Scythians. When the uprising of the Conian cities was overcome, Miletus was burned, the men mostly slain, the women and children sold as slaves. Many other cities were burned, and a part of the inhabitants, as well as the population of whole islands, were transferred to the interior of the Persian Empire. - When Eretria fell into the hands of the Persians during the second campaign against Greece, the city was destroyed by fire and the population was dragged away in fetters. - When, under his successor Xerxes, the bridge over the Hellespont was destroyed by a storm, he not only scourged the sea as punishment, but also beheaded the builders of the bridge. - In Doris and Phocis, after the conquest of the Termopylae, twelve cities were plundered and reduced to ashes, and even Platää and Thespiä, two cities of the Persian-minded Boeotians, were devastated. - The deserted Athens was plundered and burned to the ground, and the few persons, some poor and some old, who were in the castle were cut down in the temple where they had taken refuge. - When Cyrus the Younger rose up against his brother Artaxerxes II Memnon and fell in battle, the latter certified himself victorious before his doubting army by the cut-off head of his brother, which he himself held aloft. - Although the Greeks, who had served under Cyrus the Younger, had been promised safe return in a solemnly sworn treaty, they had always to be on their guard lest they should be destroyed by the Persian army accompanying them. Indeed, during a meeting between their leader Klearch and the Persian satrap Tissaphernes, the former and four other colonels were arrested against their previously given word and later executed by order of the king, while his retinue of 20 captains and 200 soldiers were cut down. - The successor of Artaxerxes II Memnon, Artaxerxes III Ochus, sought to establish himself on the throne by murdering all his brothers and relatives. - When he had restored Phoenicia and Egypt to obedience, he perpetrated great cruelties in both countries. Out of wantonness he had the sacred bull Apis slaughtered in Egypt and prepared for dinner. - He was poisoned by his commander Bagoas and his corpse was thrown to the cats. From his bones they made saber handles in mockery. - Finally, the murder of the last Persian king, Darius...

Kodomannus, to be mentioned. After Bessus, one of the great men of the empire, had taken him prisoner, he did not want to let him fall alive into the hands of Alexander as he fled, while Darius did not want to flee, but preferred to be in the power of Alexander rather than of Bessus. Then Bessus threw his spear at the king, who was bound, and the rest of the present great men of the empire did likewise, and then they dashed away, leaving the king dying.

Judging from the historical data given so far, everyone can see that the Medo-Persian empire could very well have been symbolized by a bear.

Now let us look at the further description of this bear, first of all it says: "And stood on one side". These difficult words have received many interpretations. Some think that the bear stood on one side of the circle of the earth, namely, that the beginnings of this kingdom were so small that they were not noticed; others: The bear stood apart, namely from Judea, he did not harm the Jewish people; Others: The bear stood on his one side, he was erect on one side; Others, and this is probably the simplest: The bear stood on one side of the lion, ready to fall into his flanks. We should then think that the bear had already risen from the sea and assumed this position, while with the winged lion the changes suggesting decay were taking place. This position also fits the kingdom of Mcdopers, which lay on the northern side of the Chaldean-Babylonian empire, cf. Jer. 50:41, and while the latter was falling into decay, Cyrus gave it more and more power, until Babylon finally fell.

Now it is further said of the bear, "He had in his mouth under his teeth three great long teeth." The word which Luther has here translated by "great long teeth" is really "nips," as he himself says in his preface to the prophet Daniel: "And hath under his teeth three ribs (that is, three great long teeth)." (Walch VI, 1438.) So also Lucas Osiander and Calov understand these ribs, and with Luther interpret them of the three "most distinguished kings, Cores, Darms, Xerxes, who did most in this kingdom." (Ibid.) But apart from the fact that it would be somewhat unusual for kings to be symbolized by teeth, whereas horns otherwise serve to symbolize them (cf. Cap. 8.), there is nothing that compels us to depart from the proper meaning of the word; indeed, the history of the Persian empire speaks in favor of retaining it, as vultures do, and probably without exception the more recent interpreters do. The bear has three ribs between its teeth. What do these mean? One has probably wanted to understand them from three parts of the empire, from Media, Persia, and Babylonia or from the east, north, and south of the empire or from the

West, North and South of it. But the countries that originally belonged to the Medo-Persian empire when it attained greater power are already symbolized in the bear. We will have to understand the ribs rather of later conquered kingdoms, for the bear with the ribs between its teeth appears as a predator that has its prey in its mouth. Cf. Job 29, 17. Ps. 124, 6. The three ribs are the three main conquests of the Medo-Persian empire, which has already been discussed. Cyrus conquered Lydia, then in connection with Kyaxares II Babylon, finally Cambyses Egypt.

Finally it says: "And they said unto him, Arise, and eat much flesh. This is probably to be understood as a command of God, as the same is also given to the Medes and Persians in Isa. 21, 2. This command, just like the one in Isa. 21, 2, indicates what the kingdom would not only try to do, but also what it would accomplish. But what is indicated by this? Geier thinks with Luther that here the victory over many nations is prophesied, and Lucas Osiander and Calov have just this opinion, but the latter also emphasizes that great bloodshed is indicated. If we search the Scriptures, we find that "flesh" is used of man, Isa. 66, 24. 40, 6. 7. According to the Scriptures, "devour" means partly to destroy completely, so 3 Mos. 26, 38. 4 Mos. 24, 8. Jer. 5, 6. 17. partly to oppress, torment, torture, so Jer. 50, 17. According to this, it would be prophesied by this command that this kingdom would kill many people, oppress others hard and torment them. - And this was confirmed in the case of the Medean empire. It has destroyed many men, especially if we look not only at the number of enemies it has killed, but also at those it has lost from its own armies. The text does not prevent us from doing this, for it was itself to blame for the terrible human losses that the Medean empire suffered, inasmuch as it often undertook its wars without necessity, solely out of a desire for conquest. - How great the number of men who perished in this empire is, cannot, of course, be determined exactly, but it was certainly extraordinarily great. Some historical data may well prove this. The conquest of Lydia by Cyrus certainly cost many human victims, since the first battle at Pteria remained undecided because of the bravery of both armies. Babylon's fall certainly cost the life of Belshazzar and his imperial greats assembled with him. Of the cruelties of Cambyses in Egypt and how one of his armies slaughtered and ate the tenth man even by lot, has already been dealt with. His army of 50,000 men, which he sent against Ammonium, disappeared without a trace in the desert and was probably buried by sand whirlpools. Darius Hystaspis had 3000 Babylonians crucified, his army which was to subjugate the Cyrenean north coast of Africa was repulsed with loss, to the Scythians he gave

fleeing, he gave away his most frail crew. By the apostasy of the cities of Asia Minor, which was atoned for with much blood, he was induced to make his two campaigns against Greece. Though he did not attain his object by the same, yet they cost great human sacrifice. In the first campaign under Mardonius, the fleet failed at the promontory of Athos, where 300 ships with 20,000 men were wrecked. Also the land army had some losses, especially in the fight with the Brygians. In the second campaign under Datis and Artaphernes, the Persians lost 6,400 dead at Marathon, the Greeks 192. - Xerxes made an even more costly move against Greece. With an army of 1,700,000 men, among them 80,000 on horseback, together with the many on camels and chariots, and a fleet of 1207 ships, he marched on. Of this fleet 400 ships failed in a storm; the nest fought with the Greek fleet of 280 ships at Euboea, where, however, in spite of the great losses on both sides, no decision was reached; in the main battle, in the strait of Salamis, the Persians lost 200, the Greeks 40 ships. Shipwrecks and human corpses covered the sea. When Xerxes hurried with the largest part of his land army to the Hellesponte, many of his troops were destroyed by disease and hunger. Of the 300,000 core troops that remained in Greece under Mardonius, more than 230,000 fell at Plataea. On the same day the Persians also suffered a great defeat at Mykale. - The battle of Kunaxa, where Cyrus led 83,000 men against his brother Artaxerxes II Memnon's army of 400,000, lasted until night. - What great defeats at last the Medo-Persian empire suffered under its last king, Darius Kodomannus! In the battle of Granicus, 1000 of the 20,000 Persian horsemen fell, while almost none of the infantry escaped, but 2000 were captured. - In the battle of Issus the Persians numbered 400,000, according to others even 600,000 men. In the fierce battle, however, they were not only completely defeated, but also driven to wild flight, in which almost as many perished as in the battle. With only 4000 men Darius got across the Euphrates. - In the battle of Gaugamela and Arbela Darius had an army of many hundreds of thousands (according to some 400,000 on foot and 100,000 on horseback, according to others even twice that number). The statement that 300,000 of this mighty army had fallen may be exaggerated, but in any case the number of the fallen was very great. The loss of the 40,000 foot soldiers and 7000 horsemen of the Macedonians is variously given as 100 to 500. - Who would not see from these historical data that the Medo-Persian Empire "ate much flesh"?

But with this expression also the pressure exerted on the subjects or enemies can be meant at the same time, and also this can be explained in the case of the

Medo-Persian empire. Here we may only recall recently some of the things that have already been mentioned. What treatment the Egyptians received from Cambyses; how did the cities of Asia Minor pay for their apostasy from Darius Hystaspis; how did Xerxes devastate Doris and Phocis, as well as Attica.

So everything revealed in the two dream visions of the second kingdom fits the Mede-Persian kingdom. - We now proceed to the third kingdom.

(To be continued.)

The papacy.

(The core of this essay will appear in the "Lutheran" according to the synodal decision).

The apostle Paul admonishes his Thessalonians in the second chapter of his second letter not to think about the last day too close. For it will not come unless the apostasy comes first and the man of sin and the child of destruction is revealed, who is an abominable man and exalts himself above all that is called God or worship, so that he sits down in the temple of God as a god and pretends to be God. In the following the apostle explains that the future of the Antichrist will happen with lying powers, signs and wonders.

The late Professor Hengstenberg believed that the apostle here meant Hegelian philosophy, Others: Napoleon. Others still differently. We must not forget, however, that St. Paul named four characteristics to make the historical phenomenon he prophesies knowable to us: first, apostasy. Not an apostasy. But the apostasy in a bad way. The apostasy which in extent, depth, and duration far surpasses any other before or since. -

Our adversaries often accuse us of claiming something monstrous: that a large part of the church departed from the right line a few hundred years after the death of the apostles and has remained in this error to this day. To be sure, this is something monstrous, but it is a monstrous thing that the Holy Spirit predicts here, so that we will not be misled when it happens. By the way, we admit that modern unbelief could also be meant, if this characteristic stood alone.

But Paul adds that the soul of the great apostasy should be a person. And that is a person who will be alive until the last day. That must be a very long-lived person! - But now our adversaries come and say, Not a long-lived person, but the whole thing is future. The man of sin shall live 3½ years before

appear at the last day, and then be killed by the spirit of the mouth of Christ. But this is not according to the apostle's mind. For he says that already in his time wickedness was stirring secretly. Only the κατέχων, the Roman empire, still restrained it. According to this
Under this mystery of wickedness we understand a historical phenomenon whose roots go back to the very earliest times of Christianity.

So: a falling away that begins early, that then always finds its center in a consistent person (traditionally), and that continues until Judgment Day.

And now the third characteristic: The future of this Antichrist happens with all kinds of lying powers, signs and wonders. Did Professor Hegel perform miracles, or Strauss, or Renan? Or any of those who have fallen from the word of God for a thousand years? I think not.

Here it becomes clear: the apostle cannot have meant anything else than the papacy. Outrageous and permanent apostasy! One person in the center! Lying miracles!

And finally the fourth:

He exalts himself above all that is called God and worship; he sits down in the temple of God and pretends to be God. There is no other temple of God today than the church. That the popes now sit in it, everybody knows. The atheists sit outside. - The pope also pretends to be God, for he declares himself infallible and preaches that there is salvation in no one else but in him.

This simple doctrine, the doctrine of the Schmalkaldic Articles, is confirmed by history. - Admittedly, the Antichrist did not come forth armed as in the fable of Pallas from the head of Zeus, but he first stirred secretly, then he developed further and further until Pope Pius the 9th.

In the history of its development, however, three periods stand out: the time of foundation, the time of growth and the time of completion.

The first period is the time of the imperial struggle, the second that of the conciliar struggle, the third that of the Protestant struggle. From the first period we name three popes: Boniface III, Stephen II, and Gregory VII. Of the second period again three: Innocent III-, the Pope of Iron, Boniface VIII-, the Fool, and Pope Eugene IV - Just as many of the third, namely, Pius IV-, the Tridentine, Pius VII-, the Pope of the Restoration, and Pope Pius IX.

The Roman church was a righteous church in the days of St. Paul and long after. Among its bishops it counted six martyrs and more than six writers. In her midst taught St. Clement, the disciple of St. Paul, the author of the excellent Epistle to the Corinthians, in which justification by faith is preached. In their midst shone Bishop Leo I, whose epistle to the general assembly of the Church at Chalcedon was adopted as a common confession, whose intercession moved the fierce Hun prince Attila to repentance.

Even Gregory I distinguished himself - despite some errors in detail - by careful administration and missionary zeal.

His successor Bonifacius III, however, was seduced by the devil through arrogance.

Around 595 - while Gregory I was still in office - the bishop John of Constantinople had arrogated to himself the title of a general bishop. For this the brave Gregory punished him: Paul - so he writes - carefully avoided to subject the members of the body of Christ to certain heads. What wilt thou answer Christ, the general head of the Church, in the examination of the last judgment, who strivest to subject all his members to thee by the appointment of a general bishop? Whom dost thou follow in this but he **who,** with contempt of the English hosts, hath endeavoured to hover alone above, that he may seem to be subject to none, and to reign alone? .. . Peter, the first among the apostles, Paul, Andrew, John, what are they but heads of particular churches? And that I may say it briefly, the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace, have all been members of the church; none have wanted to be called "general." (The term "general" he explains below by *Generalis pater*, i.e. Pope.) - And in his letter to the Emperor Mauritius he confesses: "I say confidently: Whoever calls himself a pope (*universalem sacerdotem*) or demands to be called so, is in his arrogance a forerunner of Antichrist, because he arrogantly sets himself above Andre."

And no sooner had Gregory I sunk into the grave than arrogance goaded his second successor, Boniface III, to adopt the same title which Gregory I had just described as anti-Christian. And in how wretched a manner did he seek to bring it to bear! Emperor Mauritius, in fact, was assaulted by his guard-obrist Phocas. This disgraceful man, having secured the soldiers, had the five sons of the Emperor

and the emperor murdered. Then he had the empress tortured and beheaded with her three daughters. When the bishop Cyriacus of Constantinople introduced himself to the murderer, he was enraged against his pastor. Boniface III took advantage of this mood and was able to elicit a declaration from the angry man that the Roman bishop should in future be called the general bishop. Thus the Roman bishop had fallen into arrogance through the seduction of the devil, and had made a claim which was of the most extensive consequences. Admittedly, the bishops of Rome still lacked the power to assert themselves as the general bishops. But where there is the evil will, there the means are soon found. -

It was about 751, when the powerful Frankish Duke Pippin, the son of the victor of *St. Martin le beau,* sent the Abbot Folrad of 8t. with an envoy to Pope Zacharias in Rome: "Whether it be better - so they should ask - that the king be and be called, who possesses all power and business, or who possesses the name of the same".

Zacharias replied:

"*Ut melius sit, illum regem vocari, qui potestatem habeat, quam illum, qui sine regali potestate manet' ut non conturbetur ordo*."

Around 752 the envoys returned. The long-haired, quiet Childeric was locked up with his son in the monastery of Sithiu. Pippin, however, was raised to the shield of Clovis and proclaimed king. Wynfried Bonifacius anointed him in the monastery of St. Medardus at Soissons.

This was an important service which the Pope rendered to the son of Carl the Hammer. But the popes did nothing in vain. A year after the coronation, Pope Stephen appeared in France. He had not shied away from the snows of the St. Bernard mountain and threw himself at Pippin's feet at Pontion in Pertois on the Marne. Help against Aistulf! Well! After Stephen had anointed the prince of the Franks, the two of them set out for Italy. Aistulf was besieged at Pavia and forced to cede the great triangle north of Rome, the base of which was the road from Bologna to Ancona. This was the beginning of the Papal States. The Lord had said, "The kings of this world reign, and the mighty are called gracious lords, but ye are not so. Stephen and his followers did not delete this from Matth. 20, 26. and put also in its place.

Thus the Antichrist had a sword in his hand. From that time on he sought to subdue all things. But he was opposed by the power of the emperor. And as long as the emperors feared God, like Carl, like the first two Henrys and the Ottonians, there was nothing against them.

...to deliver the message. But when a six-year-old child, the son of the Empress Agnes, ascended the throne, the Antichrist believed his hour had come.

On the 22nd of April in the year 1073 Hildebrand became pope. A man of great gifts of intellect and will, but of irrepressible imperiousness. He watched the follies of Henry IV with the eye of the tiger that waits the moment to pounce on its prey. The disgraceful education which the two clergymen Anno of Cologne and Adalbert of Bremen had given the young prince had brought his hereditary corruption to full bloom. He was a rascal through and through. Hence the success of the Pope; for in itself his enterprise was so strong that he would infallibly have drawn the short straw in the face of a resolute, even mediocre Emperor!

His plan, in fact, amounted to nothing less than to bring into his hands the appointment of all the clergy from the Schlei to the Eisack. An enterprise just as furious as if the Queen of England had taken it into her head to appoint the General Presbyter and the DistrictS Presbyters of the Missouri Synod.

And yet Gregory prevailed with it; for the emperor exercised the right, which his ancestors administered in agreement with the capitulars, arbitrarily. He also appointed quite incompetent persons, and even sold individual bishoprics. - Thus the desire gradually arose to oust the emperor altogether from participation in the filling of ecclesiastical offices. When Henry, moreover, by his cruelty, brought the Saxons into harness against himself, and by his dissolute economy the others, Gregory summoned him before his judgment seat and banished him when he refused to appear. Indeed, at his synod in Rome, he absolved all Germany from the oath of allegiance it had sworn to the emperor. Thus acted the pretended successor of St. Peter. And St. Peter himself said, "Be subject with all fear to the Lord, not only to the kind and gentle, but also to the whimsical." Peter ulso bound all subjects to their masters, even to heathen, evil-minded ones. And his successor tore them loose even from Christian ones.

Then Henry IV came in December 1076 over Mont Cenis to Canossa. It was a hard winter and the Rhine was frozen from November to mid-March. The Alps, however, were full of snow, and Queen Bertha had to be tied to an oxhide and lowered down the slopes on ropes.

On January 25, 1076, the King of Germany appeared as a penitent at the curtain wall of Canossa. That Gregory made him stand three days and three nights between the second and third wall in a woollen shirt and barefoot, the emperor might have deserved by his sins. -

What followed, however, exceeds all belief and shows the true character of the papacy represented by Gregory VII. - After the pope, urged by the margravine Matilda and by Hugh of Clugny, had absolved Henry on his penitent confession, he performed the following farce: He held a great assembly in the church of Canossa, celebrated mass there, and after consecrating the host, he asked King Henry to take half if he knew himself to be clean of all the transgressions of which he was accused. Think: a priest who first demands a confession of guilt, who then absolves, and who then asks the cleansed person to declare himself innocent. The purpose of this perfidious procedure was to destroy Henry for all time in the opinion of all present. - The emperor rejected the host, but from that moment it was clear to him that he was dealing with the first-born of Satan. Even those who were far away judged: *Dimissus est (Henricus) in pace, qualem scilicet pacem Judas simulavit, non qualem Christus reliquit*. Thus Gregory exercised his power. Thus he knew how to press the empire under his sole. But he tore the clergy away from human society by introducing forced celibacy and made them the Pope's satellites. Truly our ancestors were not wrong when they called him hellfire.

And now the second time: the time of growth. Here we encounter three papal figures: The iron Innocent, the furious Boniface and the serpentine Eugene.

Count Lothar Conti, after studying theology in Paris, was elected Pope in his 37th year. Before he became pope, he wrote a book *de contemtu mundi*. But as pope he showed how he understood the contempt of the world. He despised the world not like the missionary who renounces it for the sake of the Word of God, but like the banker who ruthlessly makes it his servant.

His principles he enunciated in his epistles: *Dominus Petro non solum universam ecclesiam, sed totum reliquit saeculum gubernandum (ep. 2, 209.). Unb Registr. epist. 18th: Singuli reges habent singula regna. Sed Petrus sicut plenitudine sic et latitudine praeeminet universis, quia vicarius est illius, cujus est terra et plenitudo ejus*.

The kings of this world reign, and the mighty are called merciful lords. But ye are not so, saith Christ.

The kings... so do we, saith Antichrist. And it was on these principles that Innocent III acted. In Germany he first smote the Hohenstaufens by the Welsh, and then the Welsh by the Hohenstaufens. Spain and France trembled before his edicts. In England he even succeeded in usurping sovereignty directly.

For it was an ambiguous election in the Archbishopric of Canterbury. The younger clergy chose Brother Reginald, the older John Gray, the king's candidate. Then Innocent casted both elections and appointed as Archbishop of Canterbury Stephen Langton, a cardinal of the Roman Church. Of course, King John resisted. But the Pope imposed the Interdict on England, that is, he forbade all worship until the king would have crawled to his cross. So, in order to strike the shepherd (who, of course, was a scoundrel), he cast the sheep into hell. When the barons rose up, when Philip Auguste of France prepared himself, then John's defiance broke. But he could obtain forgiveness from the pope on no other condition than that he should give England to the pope and then take it again from him as a fief against payment of 1000 marks a year.

But to increase his means of power, Innocent III founded two institutes: the mendicant orders and the Inquisition. He used the simple, almost cynical piety of the young Francis of Assisi and the fervent preaching zeal of Domingo Guzman to bring baptizing fanatics under his banner. From then on monks were no longer understood to be those quiet ascetics who sacrificed the sweat of their faces to serve the poor, but a band of beggars and preachers ready at any moment to fight the Pope's battles.

But the Inquisition was called into being by Pope Innocent, in order to ferret out possible and impossible heresies at all ends of the earth, as much as he could. And how faithfully the bishops followed his footsteps! The house in which a heretic was found fell to destruction (according to the provisions of the Council of Toulouse Anno 1229. Mans! XXIII, 192.). If heretics voluntarily returned to the faith, they were transferred to an unsuspected place, but to denote their former error they had to wear on the right and left side two crosses protruding in color (ibid., Duke 679.). The sick, but suspected of heresy, were not allowed to have a physician (*officio medici non utantur*). (Ibid., Duke 680.) It is not necessary to speak of the abominations that were attached to this in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries.

In England at this time one said: "O how very different from Peter are those who appropriate the power of Peter" (Matthäus Paris bei Neander IX, 338. Ausg. von 1841.), but in Germany downright: Papa est draco magnus, qui seduxit universum orbem (est) antichristus (Fridericus II. apud Petrum de Vineis 1, 31. Niedner 448.).

The iron pope was followed by the frenzied one: Bonifacius VIII. It was wise of Bonifacius VIII, or rather of Cardinal Benedict Cajetano...

(for that was his original name) that he induced old Cölestin, the hermit on the papal throne, to abdicate. It was a mark of superior adroitness that on Christmas Eve 1294 he procured for himself the votes of all the Cardinals for the election of the Pope. But it was base of him to have poor old Cölestin seized and confined in the rock dungeons of Fumone. There he died after two years.

But Boniface had scarcely seized the reins of the papal regiment when he renewed the claims of his ancestors, Gregory VII and Innocent III, to unconditional rule with the fury of a lion. First he expelled the Colonnas, who had been opposed to his election. Their castles were destroyed, their city of Palestrina was razed to the ground, the plough was driven over it, and salt was scattered. Then he interfered in the war between England and France. When King Philip the Fair firmly repudiated such interference, Boniface forbade the French clergy to pay taxes to the king. Philip replied by prohibiting the export of gold and silver from France. A testy correspondence followed: *Bonifacius episcopus servus servorum Dei Philippo Francorum regi*, wrote the pope. *Deum time et mandata ejus observa. Scire te volumus, quod in spiritualibus et temporalibus nobis subes . . . aliud credentes haereticos reputamus. Jlbntg Rpiltpp erwiberte: Philippus, Dei gratia Francorum rex Bonifacio se gerenti pro summo pontifice salutem modicam sive nullam. Sciat maxima tua fatuitas, in temporalibus nos alicui non subesse . . . secus autem credentes fatuos et dementes reputamus.*

Now Pope Boniface believed that the opportunity had come to pronounce the great principles of antichristianity publicly and in context. Therefore, on November 18, 1302, he issued the famous bull: *Unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam,* which still today forms an integral part of papal canon law. There is only one (visible) Church, he declares in it. The church, however, is not a two-headed monster, but has one head, - the pope. This one visible Lord has both swords, the spiritual and the temporal. This is most clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures. For, let it be heard, and let it be wondered at, when the disciples said to Christ: Lord, behold, here are two swords, he answered, It is enough.

The prophet Jeremiah also teaches that the pope has power over all things. Namely, Cap. 1, v. 10: "Behold, I set thee this day over nations and kingdoms, to pluck up, and to break, and to destroy, and to destroy. Also the apostle Paul expressly declares 1 Cor. 2, 15. "The spiritual judgeth all things, and is judged of none."

He who puts temporal power next to spiritual power is a Manichaean, for he teaches two principles. And yet the Holy Spirit expressly declares in Genesis 1 that there is only One Principle: *in principio* coelum Deus creavit et terram, in One Principle God created heaven and earth. That XXXXX is called in the beginning is of course of no concern to such gifted persons.*)

Having shown in so brilliant and irrefutable a manner the scriptural ground of his claim to unconditional dominion, Pope Boniface plays his trump card and concludes: *Porro subesse Romano pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, diffinimus et pronuntiamus, omnino esse de necessitate salutis*. To obey the Roman pope, we solemnly declare, is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature. Well, he now became miserably disgraced. On September 7, 1304, William of Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna attacked him in his native city of Anagni. For three days and three nights they held him prisoner near the rock dungeon where Celestine V died. And when he was freed by the Anagnese on the fourth, he had lost his senses. True, his countrymen brought him food with touching activity, poured wine into an old suitcase . . but it was all in vain. Boniface ran his forehead against the wall and died in the fury. *Intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut leo, mortuus est ut canis*, Thomas Walsingham aptly says.

---

*) Unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et ipsam apostolicam, urgente fide credere cogimur et tenere.- Nosque hanc firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur: extra quam nec salus est nec remissio peccatorum, sponso in canticis proclamante: una est columba mea, perfecta mea . . . quae unum corpus mysticum repraesentat, cujus caput Christus, Christi vero Deus. In qua unus dominus, una fides; unum baptisma. . . , . Haec est tunica illa Domini inconsutilis, quae scissa non fuit, sed sorte provenit. Igitur ecclesiae unius et unicae unum corpus, unum caput; non duo capita quasi monstrum, Christus videlicet et Christi vicarius Petrus, Petrique successor, dicente domino ipso Petro: Pasce oves meas. Meas inquit, et generaliter; non singulariter has vel illas, per quod commisisse sibi intelligitur universas. Sive ergo Graeci sive alii se dicant Petro ejusque successoribus non esse commissos, fateantur necesse, se de ovibus Christi non esse; dicente domino in Johanne: unum ovile et unicum esse pastorem. In hac ejusque potestate duos esse gladios, spiritualem et temporalem, evangelicis dictis instruimur. Nam dicentibus apostolis: ecce glacbii duo hic, in ecclesia scilicet, quum apostoli loquerentur, non respondit dominus nimis esse, sed satis. Certe qui in potestate Petri temporalem gladium esse negat, male verbum attendit domini proferentis : converte gladium tuum in vaginam. Uterque ergo est in potestate ecclesiae, spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis. Sed is quidem pro ecclesia, ille vero ab ecclesia exercendus. Ille sacerdotis, is manu regum et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis. Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subjici potestati. . . Nam veritate testante, spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet et judicare, si bona non fuerit. Sic de ecclesia et ecclesiastica potestate verificatur vaticinium Hieremiae: ecce constitui te hodie super gentes et regna et caetera, quae sequuntur. Ergo si deviat terrena potestas, judicabitur a potestate spirituali, sed si deviat spiritualis minor, a sua superiori; si vero suprema, a solo Deo, non ab homine poterit judicari, testante apostolo: Spiritualis homo judicat omnia, ipse autem a nemine judicatur. . . Quicunque igitur huic potestati a Deo sic ordinatae resistit, Dei ordinationi resistit, nisi duo (sicut Manichaeus) fingat esse principia, quod falsum et haereticum judicamus; quia testante Moyse, non in principiis, sed in principio coelum Deus creavit et terram. Porro subesse Romano pontifici etc.

The time that followed was not favorable for the papacy. The furious arrogance of Pope Boniface VIII had disillusioned the peoples. First the popes had to go into exile. There in Avignon, on the banks of the Rhone, they stayed for 70 years. Then followed the two-papacy, a Manichaean monstrosity, to speak with Pope Boniface VIII. The bishops did well to carry out a reformation. Yes, there were conciliar churches in the first half of the 15th century, but they could do nothing against the Antichrist of Rome. They themselves were caught in his snares. How else could the Costnitzers have burned Huss, how could the Baselers have raised the doctrine of the immaculate conception to dogma! And who were the letters of the church assemblies of Pisa, of Costnitz, of Basle? *Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Charlier de Gerson,* and the Cardinal Cesarini. People who were far from arguing under the banner of the Word of God. For this reason the Popes succeeded in mastering the whole movement in the most perfect manner. The end of all the proud declarations of the glory of the universal Church was the Florentine decree of June 8, 1439:

> *Item definimus* - so decreed the Synod of Florence - *sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctor em exsistere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.* (Caranza 648. 649. Edition of 1679.)

Thus, Pope Eugene IV, the man Gabriel, as the men of Basel called him, embodied the victory of antichristianity over false reform; papacy had become great. But before it was accomplished, the faithful God saw to it that it was revealed to everyone.

That happened through Luther. Wonderful: As late as 1516, Pope Leo X, in the midst of his Lateran Council, had by public decree, for very valid founders; forbidden to preach of the coming of Antichrist. (Tempus quoque praefixum futurorum malorum vel Antichristi adventum . . . praedicare vel asserere nequaquam praesumant. Caranza 671. edition of 1679.) lind nor were twelve.

After a few months, Luther appeared and illuminated the whole question with the torch of the divine word in the most profound way. The Antichrist, however, might lose the baptizing and the baptizing from the meshes of his great net, - he did not become any different thereby. On the contrary, he was now even more resolute than before against all improvement.

This conclusion refers to the Council of Trident. There to the south of Tyrol the pope sent his faithful; there they had to follow Luther's teaching.

In December 1563 the whole thing was confirmed. This lasted with pauses from 1545 to 1563, and in December 1563 the whole thing was confirmed. But in order to formally promote antichristianity one step further, Pope Pius IV at the same time issued the so-called *Professio fidei Tridentina*. This is an oath by which all clergy, indeed all who are inclined to convert to the Roman Church, must commit themselves to blind and unconditional obedience to the Roman Pontiff.

Then, after the revolution had swept through England, France, and Germany, after it had apparently done some damage to Roman antichristianity, another Pius came to the helm and restored Roman things to their original position.

Pius VII, who first anointed Napoleon on December 2, 1804, in the Notre Dame Church of Paris, and then banished him as the robber of his Papal States, used the fall of the mighty one to put everything back in its old place. The old claims as well as the old means. Intelligent illi aliquando, he wrote of the princes hostile to him, imperio ipsos nostro ac throno lege Christi subjici. For let it not be equitable, spiritum carni et coelestia terrenis cedere (Duke 725.). But as to the restoration of his antichristic means, he restored the Inquisition and the Jesuits.

And once more the current of revolution roared through Europe; and once more the Roman Antichrist arose, like the willow after it has bent its branches under the wind. Pio nono, or, as his real name is, Count Mastai Ferretti, seems destined to lend his polish to Antichristianity. It was he, after all, who on December 8, 1854, invented a new dogma, the dogma of the sinless conception of the Virgin Mary in the womb of St. Anne. But he who invents dogmas thereby declares himself to be the source of truth. Now he is even about to have the recognition of his divinity, i.e., his infallibility, solemnly proclaimed by the bishops who are subject to him. With this the growth of the papacy would be complete, and thus would be fulfilled what Scripture says of the adversary, "that he makes himself God.

Of course, we are told: Pio IX is a dear pious man. But are not the holy angels also good, not also pious? And yet St. Paul says: If I also, or an angel from heaven, preach the gospel to you otherwise than that we have preached it to you, let him be accursed. As we have now said, so say we again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The "New Lutheran" Synod of Maryland, which belongs to the old General Synod, has been struck with a severe blow, which the most reverend President of this body (according to the recently published Synodal Report) remembers in his annual report to his Synod in the most detailed and painful manner. In what then does the said blow consist? Has that venerable body lost its pure confession? Instead of the answer to this, dear reader, remember that beggar who rejoiced greatly that the treasure which the rich man must guard so carefully could not be stolen from him. So, in the end, a capable teacher died away from the venerable Synod? A similar reply could be made to this, and moreover the President is very pleased that "we are all here," so that none of the heads of his loved ones is missing. Or have any congregations been lost? Although it is rumored that some congregations, together with their preachers, have recently left the venerable body of the Synod for the sake of their consciences and have turned to the repulsive "***foreigners***" and "symbolists," the President could not have known anything about this in his official report. Well, tell it out at last, what kind of a blow did that synod suffer? So be it, hear and be amazed: "For some years the minutes and other documents of the Synod seemed to have disappeared. Alas! Who then has had them in safekeeping? Yes, that too has disappeared without a trace, namely the synodal suitcase. That would certainly be a considerable loss, if this suitcase were no longer to be found, one would search for it! Not so, my dear fellow, since it was old and "decayed, the complete loss of it would not be a matter of importance. But the synodal acts? Yes, that is another thing of its own. It is not so bad, because for the time being they have been partially recovered (even if unaccompanied by the suitcase) and then note: "Since after a serious examination of them most of them turned out to be completely worthless papers and unnecessarily weighed down the suitcase" (which has disappeared without a trace), they were destroyed as the best thing that could be done with them. However, and this is a real loss, the Jncorporation deed of said honorable corporation was missing from the disintegrated corporation case, which, however, shall also (namely the deed) be prescribed again by Annapolis. So the damage would then be made good? Well, in order to prevent such acckdents, which are no longer uncommon in America, in the future, the synodal secretary had received the order to acquire a new synodal case, but "because of his moving away from our synodal borders, as I assume, he has refrained from doing so," report the Reverend Father the President in another place. The latter himself has also refrained from doing so, as he reports: "because I thought that the minutes should be kept in them and therefore it seemed good to me to postpone the purchase of a suitcase" - until the venerable body would have determined the respective weight and dimensions of the minutes, after which the size and carrying capacity of the body's suitcase would have to be assessed. -

But where might the rogue, the suitcase, have gone? Yes, that is not to be guessed ... or, or should that be secretly connected with the fact that the venerable gentlemen from that synod considered it necessary to take such serious temperance resolutions, and also warned against the sale of intoxicating beverages? To be sure

these intentions of temperance have turned into abstinence resolutions - burnt children usually fear the fire, and in order to control intemperance, complete abstinence is often good, even necessary.... But to apply this to the venerable gentlemen of the Synod, or even to connect it with the disappearance of the "happy" Synodal-Kosser, would be too mischievous!

From the Synodal Report of the venerable body itself, many things would be mentioned, such as E. "Lutheran Mission" at St. Louis Mo. money appropriation Hiezu; Lutheran Church A. W. Roeder, Carr and 15th streets, St. Louis; "Lutheran." Missionary Local at Masonic Hall, Carr and 10th Streets, Synodal Prayer Hours there; denial of traveling money to a delegate sent by the venerable body to the New York Synod, because such reimbursement "is not the custom of this Synod"; receipt of a delegate from the New York Ministry; deputation of a delegate to the Pennsylvania Synod and other sister Synods; and much more. But as it has not been determined whether these things do not come under what seems to be the standing heading of "wholly worthless" items, which "after a serious perusal, as the best that can be done with them, will yet be destroyed," they will not be further dealt with here. However, the fact that the "annual report", like the entire Synodal Report, is a thankful addition to cheer up melancholy hours, is hereby duly acknowledged.

F. W. Sch.

Lutheran Progress in America. The Lutheran newspaper "Immanuel", published in Halberstadt (Prussia), writes in its latest issue: "We can recognize a pleasing progress in the views and behavior of the Missourians in North America in the fact that they have entered into a brotherly covenant with the Lutheran Ohio Synod to recognize each other as orthodox synods, whose congregations are to coexist amiably, settle any disputes they may have, and support each other in love. In former times such coexistence of several Lutheran synods in one country was declared schismatic and sinful. It has thus been recognized that several synods of the Lutheran confession can exist side by side without always having to form one.

II. Abroad.

German Catholicism has emerged anew in Austria with the confessional laws, and steps have already been taken to obtain state recognition for it. On March 12, a former priest, August Forstner, and a layman, Dr. Rudolph Weinberger, presented a petition to the Minister of Culture, von Hasner, requesting legal recognition of the new confession of faith in the sense and on the basis of the state laws. The petition in question states, among other things: "We present, filled with the most joyful hope, our confession of faith most reverently to a high Ministry of Cultus and look forward with full confidence to an early fulfillment of our most sacred wishes. Also, trusting in the help of the Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ, we pledge to adhere to this confession until the end, as it is contained in the following articles.** Minister v. Hasner has kindly and benevolently granted the petitioners, promising them first the organization of private worship and later recognition through a bill to be presented to the Imperial Council. The strength of the followers does not yet seem to be great; however, it would be important if the news were confirmed that individual rural communities were inclined to convert as a whole.

The confession of faith of these "German or New Catholics" is contained in 26 articles, the main content of which is as follows: It is "taught and confessed the Most Holy Trinity ("three persons of the same nature, and that these three are only One God"); Christ, Son of God and Son of Man died for us, "so that through his suffering and death he might become the atoning sacrifice for all the sins of mankind"; risen, ascended to heaven, until he will return on the last day. The canonical books of the Old and New Testaments are acknowledged as the source of all the doctrines of faith of the "new Catholic Church"; sacraments she counts four: baptism, penance, holy communion, ordination; in the sacraments she counts four: baptism, penance, holy communion, ordination. Holy Communion, ordination; in the doctrine of Holy Communion the transubstantiation is rejected. In the doctrine of Holy Communion it rejects the doctrine of transubstantiation, but also the doctrine of those "who maintain that Jesus Christ is not really and essentially present in the species of bread and wine, and that it is not proper to offer divine homage and veneration to the most holy sacrament." Prayer for the departed is recognized as legitimate, but the doctrine of purgatory is rejected, as is the doctrine of undeniable (?) good works. The New Catholic Church expressly renounces the Pope and the Roman hierarchy. The use of the Latin language is no longer to take place; veneration of the saints in so far as the example of the saints is acknowledged and we, as their brothers and sisters still walking in time, commend ourselves to their intercession with Jesus," etc. One looks in vain for an article on "justification by faith" in this confession. Of Johannes Ronge, who is at present again preaching in Vienna, even the Viennese press judges: "He is strong in the negative, lively where he goes to work on the ultramontanes, but very blurred and phrascurcic in the positive area .

Austria. The arrest and trial of the Bishop of Linz v. Rüdiger caused a great stir. In a so-called pastoral letter, he had openly called for non-observance of the confessional laws and for resistance against the government, and for this reason was cited before the Linz Regional Court. Rüdiger, however, invoking the Concordat which still rightly exists in the Austrian states, did not appear and, when he was finally led out of his palace into the courtroom by a police secretary and two guards, after fruitless friendly introductions, refused to answer any of the questions put to him by secular judges. - Nevertheless, the trial took its regular course. The prosecutor charged the bishop with the crime of disturbing the peace, and the jury found him guilty on six of the nine counts submitted to them. On the basis of this verdict, the public prosecutor requested a six-month light prison sentence, but the court formulated the verdict in such a way that Bishop v. Rüdiger was to be held in custody for 14 days for the attempted crime of disturbing the public peace and that the said pastoral letter was to be suppressed. The condemnation of a prince of the church by a secular court - an unheard-of act in bigoted Austria - naturally caused a great sensation. The ultramontane press could not find words enough to transform the energetic action of the government against a rebellious bishop into a dreadful crime of majesty against the Lord and His anointed, and on the other hand to glorify the bishop. From many episcopal colleagues and countless priests, from corporations and ecclesiastical colleges in Germany and abroad, even from Rome, addresses of condolence or rather congratulations were sent to the latter, and in the certain hope that the bishop would not accept a pardon from the emperor, his fourteen-day arrest was already placed alongside the imprisonment of St. John the Baptist and described as martyrdom under the new Herod.

sungen. Meanwhile the news arrives that the new Herod has pardoned the new martyr, however, and that the latter has accepted the pardon with all thanks. The Roman papers now mourn over hyperloyal Austrian bishops.

Through the new elementary school law, which Emperor Franz Joseph sanctioned "as one of the beneficial works of the Imperial Council," the Austrian elementary school is now more than before removed from the influence of the clergy and its management is centralized in the hands of the Minister of Education. The laws in question state, among other things: "All curricula and textbooks are determined by the Ministry of Education. Religious instruction is in the hands of the churches, but religious teachers must comply with the school laws. Every elementary school, for the foundation and maintenance of which the State, the Land or the municipality bears the costs in whole or in part, is a public institution and as such accessible to the youth without distinction of religious creed! R.

Dr. Schaff in Prussia. Dr. Schaff is carrying out with very good success his interesting mission in Europe as the ambassador of the Evangelical Alliance in the United States. We have already mentioned his reception in England, France, and Holland, and he was also received with joy in Germany. In Berlin he was enthusiastically received. A meeting was held and attended by the most excellent theologians, preachers, and professors, and by Hon. Georg Bancroft, the envoy of the United States, Professor Dörner, Semisch, Piper, Klenert, Messner, Kogel, and others. Dr. Hoffmann, the General-Superintendent of the Church, presided, and delivered an excellent address.

Dr. Schaff presented his invitation from the American Alliance to the German brethren to meet in the fall of 1870 in the city of New York. The invitation was received with great cordiality. Dr. Hoffmann, the most influential man in the Prussian Consistory, Professor Dörner, one of the greatest theologians in Germany, Dr. Kogel, court preacher and great pulpit orator, Count Bernstorf, son of the Prussian envoy in London, Professor Messner, editor of the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung," and others expressed their great desire to come. Dr. Tholuck in Halle also wishes to come.

From these great and good men, whose names are almost as well known here as in their own country, a delegation will be chosen, and Germany will be represented in a worthy manner at this great council of evangelical Christians, which will meet next year in the city of New York.

(Apologet.)

From the Heart of Protestant Prussia. The Order of Preachers (Dominicans) residing in Moabit near Berlin since 1866 has been granted a collection by the highest authorities for the expansion of the mission chapel and the order house; also several ladies, among them the princesses Hohenlohe and Radziwill, the merchants Schmidt and Borsig, have placed themselves at the head of a lottery enterprise for the above purpose and have taken over the distribution of lottery tickets @ 10 Sgr. per piece.

At present there are three Dominican Fathers from Düsseldorf in the house purchased by the Order in Thurmstraße. Father Ceslaus (Count Rovignano Stolberg) acts as interim superior. He has been entrusted by the War Ministry with the pastoral care of the garrison hospital (Scharnhorststraße), while the nursing care there is provided by five Grey Sisters. Mass is said daily in the simultaneous chapel of the Garrison Lazaretto, and on Sundays there is a musical High Mass. Regular services are held in the provisional chapel of the Dominicans.

The Dominican Hospice is under the protection of the Queen, who has approved a significant founding contribution and promised ongoing contributions for a number of years.

In the city of Hanover, the Prussian government has given former Hannb'verian government buildings to the Papists for monastic purposes.

Berlin. The Ober-Consistorial-Rath and pastor Dr. theol. Fournier was sentenced by the court to three months imprisonment or a fine of 300 Thalers on the charge brought against him of having slapped a pregnant bride in the sacristy of his church before the wedding ceremony and in the presence of her fiancé and many wedding guests. Dr. Fournier, on the other hand, declared in the first sermon preached after the trial that he knew himself to be free of this accusation in spite of all the witnesses' testimony. R.

Roman monasteries in Prussia. Berlin, July 3. The "Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" publishes an overview of the restored monasteries in Prussia. According to this, 142 religious orders exist in the diocese of Breslau, under 16 different names and rules: Jesuits, Franciscans, Merciful Brothers, Ursuline Sisters, Franciscan Sisters, etc., with 1028 priests, professed and lay members. The Archdiocese of Cologne contains 159 monastic institutions of 30 different kinds with 1812 religious. The diocese of the Bishop of Trier contains 59 religious institutes of 16 names with 774 members. The diocese of Münster has 168 monasteries of 17 rules with 1227, Paderborn 73 monasteries with 387, Gnesen-Posen 25 monasteries with 214, Culm 16 monasteries with 166 members. In addition, there are 27 monasteries in the districts of Fulda, Limburg, Ermeland and Glatz, the number of inhabitants of which can be given only in part. For Prussia, this gives a total of about 700 monasteries with 6000 religious. Among them are 13 Jesuit monasteries: in the Archdiocese of Cologne 5, in the Diocese of Breslau 2, in the Diocese of Trier 2, in the Diocese of Münster 2, in the Diocese of Paderborn 1, in the Diocese of Gniezno 1 (Herald of Faith).

A Story from Rome. A number of royal Prussian university preachers, etc., together with their families, worship the animal. - A number of Prussian tourists, consisting of Protestant preachers with their wives, as well as professors and artists, recently made a journey in Italy in order to make use of the reduced railway fare, which reduces the price of a so-called "round trip" by 45 cents and gives a ticket 40 days validity. During their stay in Rome, these Prussians asked for an audience with the Holy Father, and it was granted without any fuss. The question now presented itself to them, to know how far their personal dignity and position permitted them to obey the ceremonial which prescribes that one kneel down before his Holiness and kiss his foot; but the holy father, informed of this objection, said, "Let them do what their hearts shall give them!"

The audience took place. The travelers entered and immediately - the simple and yet so majestic posture of the pope, his so pure mild look, the so sympathetic sound of his voice - all this seizes them so vividly that they are involuntarily inside the traditional Cremoniell without wanting it. The greatest indifferentists, even the enemies of the pope, confess that a secret power emanates from this man, something like the power of the governor of Christ. With anointing, the Holy Father spoke to those gathered about the hopes of the Church and expressed his joy at seeing Christians around him who, in spite of their disagreement, were nevertheless his children "among themselves and with him". Then, with emotion in his voice, he said the following words:

"I will give you the blessing of the Vicar of Christ. Even if you do not yet believe in the Vicar of Christ, you will at least receive the blessing of a father."

So this is what these preachers accepted from the antichristian blasphemy of the accursed pope, who says of himself: I am the Way, the Truth and the Life. - What will they receive from the mouth of Christ, the righteous Judge? Let this be seen in Rev. 19:20 - Verily we prefer the curses of the pope to his blessings. R.

Saxony. Also the mother of the known convert to Papism: Grasen Ernst von Schönburg-Glauchau, recently entered the Catholic Church in the house chapel of the Cardinal von Reisach in Rome. - What were the counts of Schönburg doing in Rome? He who puts himself in danger perishes in it. In recent times, unauthorized pilgrimage has become a mania among Protestants. They are then often like those birds that are supposed to be so enchanted and spellbound by the terribly beautiful play of colors and eyes of a ***boa constrictor that*** they sit quietly near it and let themselves be eaten by the monstrosity. R.

Bremen. Next winter a series of apologetic lectures are to be held here. Dr. Luthardt, Uhlhorn, von Fabri, v. Tischendorf and other celebrities will speak, the latter on the authenticity of the Holy Gospels. Gospels. The original of the Greek Bible found by Prof. von Tischendorf in the Sinai Monastery in 1859 has now become the property of the Russian Crown through the mediation of the Russian Ambassador to Constantinople and is in the Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg. The Sinai Monastery, on the other hand, was richly endowed by the Russian Emperor and Tischendorf was elevated to the Russian hereditary imperial nobility for his services.

In Poland (with the exclusion of Lithuania, Volhynia, Podolia and the Ukranians) since 1863, according to the "Ostsee-Zeitung", 37 clergymen have been killed on the battlefield, or by sentence of the military court; deported to Siberia or into the interior of the Russian Empire 5 bishops, 3 prelates, 218 clergymen; imprisoned for a shorter or longer time 200 clergymen; 44 clergymen have fled from the knout.

The deportation of the Catholic Bishop of Augustovo, Count Lubiensky, recently caused a particular stir. He was allegedly taken into custody at night by Major General v. Möller on account of hostile actions against the imperial government and pro-Polish sentiments, and was led away without any trouble into the interior of the Reich. Arrived in Perm, however, he died suddenly, as they say, as a result of dysentery. Papist papers, on the other hand, speak of poison. The pope and the imperial pope also try to outdo each other in murderous crudeness, and one always becomes the scourge of the other. R.

France. Three years ago the Orthodox Reformed Consistory deposed the radical Pastor Martin; the Minister of Culture did not confirm the deportation, and Martin continues to officiate quietly. Now the same Consistory has elected an Orthodox, Paumier, to succeed the rationalist Coquerel Sr.; the Cultus Minister refuses to ask for imperial confirmation. In the meantime the ***Union liberale*** (83,000 Fr. income) is working to tear apart the Reformed Church through agents, sermons, writings; the ***Union evangelique is*** working against it.

(Monthly journal for the Lutheran Church of Prussia.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 15. November 1869. No. 11.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 38.

The preacher must be careful not to perform official acts on those who still belong to another parish without the knowledge and will of the pastor in question, whether the latter be of right or wrong faith (1 Pet. 5, 2. 4, 15. 2 Cor. 10, 15. 16. Acts 20, 18. Rom. 10, 15.), especially on those who have been lawfully banished (Match. 18, 17. 18.). But if Christians have already properly renounced their preachers and churches because of false doctrine or tyrannical practice, the preacher cannot cast such Christians away, even if they are in unjust banishment (Joh. 6, 37. Match. 11, 28. Joh. 16, 2. 3. 3 Joh. 10. Joh. 12, 42. 43. 9, 34-39.), which latter also applies in regard to travelers, especially in the case of the still.

Note 1.

Luther's writings contain many serious testimonies against ministering to persons who already have a properly appointed pastor. He writes, among other things: "That the apostles also first went into strange houses, and preached, they were commanded, and were called and sent for this purpose, that they should preach in all places, as Christ said Marc. 16:15, Go ye into all the world, and preach to every creature. But after that, no one has such a common apostolic command any more, but every bishop or pastor has his appointed church or parish, which St. Peter 1 Petr. 5, 3. also calls 'clergy,' that is, part, that every one is commanded his part of the people, as St. Paul also writes to Tito; in which no other or stranger without his knowledge and will shall be subject to his

No one shall listen to him in body and soul, but shall announce and report to his pastor or authorities. And this is to be firmly adhered to, so that no preacher, no matter how pious or righteous he may be, should dare to preach or teach secretly among the people of a pope or heretic priest without the knowledge and will of that priest. For he is not commanded to do so. But what is not commanded is to be left undone; we have enough to do if we want to do what is commanded." (Exposition of the 82nd Psalm, 1530. V, 1060. f.) Immediately before, Luther had said, "These are the thieves and murderers, of whom Christ says John 10:8, who fall into strange churches, and take hold of strange offices, which are not commanded them, but are forbidden them. "*) (p. 1059.) Compare what has been remarked on § 4. See "Lehre u. Wehre" XI, 193. ff.

Note 2.

L. Hartmann writes about the fact that a preacher should be especially careful not to accept those who have been legally banned from other congregations and thus actually absolve them: "A person who has been banned from one local congregation can by no means be accepted by another as a member of the congregation unless the congregation that banned him has been reconciled and agrees to this. For it is to the same one that the disfellowshipping belonged, and it is to them that the cause of the disfellowship is to be judged, who had to disfellowship, and a sentence which is not passed by his own judge has no validity. This belongs to the seriousness of church discipline, so that thus the stiff-necked may be cut off from every way in which they often seek to withdraw their necks from wholesome discipline." (Pastoral. ev. p. 873. s.) Those who accept those who have been lawfully baptized by other churches, even before they have been absolved from them in a competent manner, thereby commit an exceedingly grave sin. Moreover, by taking hold of another's office, they trample under foot the divine binding key, they despise the church of God and the holy office of the same, they cause a great disturbance and a division of the church, they plunge an impenitent sinner into impenitence and make himself liable to his sins, they hinder and destroy all ecclesiastical discipline and order, and they abuse the means of grace by giving the sanctuary to the dogs, contrary to Christ's prohibition, and casting their pearls before swine. Woe to them forever, if they do not repent of this in time!

*For this reason Peter, 1 Pet. 4, 15, places those who "take hold of another's office" in the same line with "murderers, thieves, and malefactors. - Concerning the fact that the true ministry still exists even in false believers, and that therefore also "heretical pastors** have the same by virtue of their received profession, cf. § 5. See "L. u. W." XI, p. 225. ff.

Note 3.

Concerning the cases in which strangers, coming from other congregations, are not to be turned away by a preacher, we leave here the following testimonies of our theologians.

Thus Luther wrote: "I also taught that one should not mix the parish laws and lure people from one parish to another, where everything is kept uniform. For what is cheaper? But I never approved that if in one the Sacrament" (unlawfully, of course) "is denied, the same should not be allowed to be desired or administered in a foreign one." (Letters collected by Schütz, translated in German. I, 336. f. Cf. De Wette IV, 387.)

Thus, the Wittenberg Theological Faculty wrote in 1656: "In sum, everything in the church should be done honestly and properly according to the admonition of the Apostle Paul 1 Corinthians 14:40, namely, that each pastor should faithfully care for his parishioners, while the parishioners hear his voice and follow him in all proper matters. But all this must be understood of well-ordered churches and preaching offices, except for persecution and such cases. . . But since it is evident from your question that your congregation, deprived of its proper pastor by papal tyranny and persecution, has, as it were, destroyed the whole church, that one here and another there must seek the sacraments from righteous preachers in other parishes because of the papal priests; In which case the church is at liberty to turn to another pure teacher and preacher, and to use his ministry, and no righteous preacher is authorized to expel any unrighteous person from his congregation, but to accept any one who comes from evening or morning, and to administer the sacraments, if he is only a righteous Christian and does true penance; as our Saviour himself says of himself: "Whatsoever cometh to me, that will I not cast out." (*Consil. Witeberg*. II, 60. f.)

Thus Heshusius writes: "If the case arises that other people, who do not belong in our parish, sit either under the antichristic papacy or under false teachers, as Calvinists, Synergists, Majorists, Adiaphorists, *) Schwenkfeldians, for whom a Christian must beware, or are being persecuted by their tyrannical

*) Since the three last-named false teachers nevertheless bore the Lutheran name and wanted to be Lutherans, it is evident from this that Heshusius also accepted such Christians who are found in nominally Lutheran congregations, but in which false doctrine is rampant, when they, for the sake of this false doctrine, break away from their congregation and seek refuge in a truly Lutheran congregation.

(2) If any of the priests of the Church have been afflicted against their conscience, or are otherwise on a journey, or are afflicted with sickness, or are otherwise in need of comfort, and wish to strengthen their conscience by the use of the sacraments, or desire our service, and seek the sacraments from us, in such and such cases we preachers are at liberty to communicate the sacraments to every man, whether he be of the going forth or coming down of the sun, provided he repents aright, and believes the gospel, in virtue of the saying of John 16:The Holy Ghost shall punish the world. 16: The Holy Ghost shall convict the world; that is, the kingdom of Christ, and the holy ministry of preaching, is spread over the whole world, and is not bound to any place, person, or time. And that the Christians, who avoid their pastors, who give out false doctrine and blasphemy or want to weigh down their conscience against God's word, and seek the sacraments in other parishes from righteous teachers, act Christianly, appears from the words of Christ Matth. 7, 15. item Paul Phil. 3, 2. Rom. 16, 17." (Dedekennus' *Thesaurus*. II, 438.)

Finally, Deyling, after testifying that one may not accept a child confessor from a neighboring orthodox confessor, continues: "Exceptions are those who come from a foreign parish in which the church servants are of a different faith, e.g. papists. If they are penitent and seek absolution in the neighborhood, it is not to be refused them. Thus Christ received a man who had been excluded by the Pharisees from their fellowship, John 9:38. A church minister, like the apostle Paul, is a debtor to all, Romans 1:14, who need his service because of the lack of others. He can neither deny the preaching of the word, nor the administration of the sacraments, to the wretched who want to renounce a false ministry. Nor are those to be exempted from the above rule who, though they come from another parish where there are orthodox ministers, are compelled to be absent from home either for military service or for commercial business or for other reasons, and have evidence of a good life. These cannot be denied absolution, if they desire it and are penitent, because they do not seek another confessor out of hatred and contempt for their pastor, but out of necessity. For the rest of the parishioners such a change is not easily permitted, and not even for the sake of disputes which they have with their pastor, if they do not have serious and long-lasting problems with their pastor.

(*) Thus, according to Heshusius, tyranny of conscience, even on the part of an otherwise rightly teaching preacher (e. g., in regard to the church discipline to be practiced with him, etc.), also gives the right to separate from him and to accept those who leave on that account. This is, of course, all the more the case if a false ban has been imposed on the person asking for admission by his previous pastor, provided that the former proves this irrefutably.

and are nourished by the pastor's fault. If, however, good reasons are given, the consistory, after having taken insight into the matter in dispute and attempted reconciliation, is accustomed to see to the change of confessor once and again, or for a time, because it cannot be denied that the confession of sins and the disclosure of inner thoughts presuppose a great trust in that person into whose bosom we pour out our soul's sorrow and from whom we expect consolation." (*Institut. prud.* pastoral. p. 442. s.) Küstner adds, "The best counsel for the pastor is, that in such disputes he himself should declare that he does not wish to compel the penitent to desire absolution from him, lest this act be performed with mutual reluctance." (*L. c.*)

Dr. Heinr. Müller explains in the "theological concerns" appended to his "Geistliche Erquickstunden" that a proven Christian is not bound to seek absolution from his obviously scandalous pastor (who otherwise preaches orthodoxly), but "may well seek it from another, so that he may thereby be put to shame and destroyed in his unholy nature. Without doubt a Christian can be just as little bound to remain with a preacher who, perhaps in spite of his willingness to do so, is utterly incapable of preaching God's word rightly.

(To be continued.)

(For the "Doctrine and Defense.")

The four kingdoms of Daniel.

Daniel Cap. 2. u. 7.

3. the Macedonian-Greek Empire.

The third kingdom is thus described: "His", the image, "belly and loins were of brass". (Cap. 2, 32.) "After these things I saw, and, behold, another beast, like a Parden, having four wings like a bird upon his back; and the same beast had four heads, and power was given unto him." (Cap. 7, 6.)

According to the ecclesiastical interpretation, this is about the Macedonian-Greek world empire, to which everything also fits quite well. In the first dream image, it is symbolized by the belly and loins of brass. As these parts of the body follow the breast, so the third kingdom is to follow the second, as the "after" (Cap. 2, 39) indicates. That this is true of the Macedonian-Greek empire is known from history. But perhaps this empire is also symbolized by the belly for another reason. Just as the belly holds all kinds of food (Sir. 36, 20.), so this empire has many different countries in it.

and "ruled over all lands" (Cap. 2, 39.), but the belly and loins are of brass, therefore the kingdom is also called "brass" (Cap. 2, 39.). By this is signified a strong mighty kingdom, which conquers others, and against which others are not able to do anything. Compare Ps. 107, 16. Is. 45, 2. Jer. 1, 18. But the ore is not as hard as iron, compare Jer. 15, 12. and this kingdom is not as destructive as the fourth one, whose symbol is iron. This also fits well to the Macedonian-Greek empire, against whose small army the Persian armies, numbering hundreds of thousands, and the not weak empires still lying to the east of the Persian empire, could not stand, while the destructive power of the following fourth, namely the Roman empire, was incomparably greater.

In the seventh chapter the Macedonian-Greek empire appears under the image of a Pard. The Pard or Parder is an animal about the size of a dog or calf and is handsome in appearance, because it has black ring-shaped spots on its brownish-yellow skin (Jer. 13, 23.). Although small, it is strong and fierce and is therefore often mentioned in connection with the lion and other beasts of prey, Isa. 11, 6. Jer. 5, 6. Hos. 13, 7. and therefore serves as an image of the angry God, Hos. 13, 7.It is cunning, so that its prey seldom escapes it, Jer. 5, 6. Hos. 13, 7. Isa. 11, 6. and therefore the image of cunning enemies, Jer. 5, 6. It is finally swift, Hab. 1, 8.

Almost all this fits the Macedonian-Greek empire. At that time, when it began its battles against Persia under Alexander, it was still small; indeed, its army in particular was infinitesimal compared to the Persian hundreds of thousands. But as small as this empire and army was, so great was its power that it overcame and destroyed every superior force, however great. - How wisely Alexander acted, moreover, to win the love and confidence of the subjugated peoples. For this reason he sacrificed to the gods of these peoples, left the administration of the subjugated territories to the former rulers, and finally sought divine confirmation as lord of Asia by cutting the Gordian knot and allowing himself to be taken for a son of Jupiter Ammon. - Finally this empire was also quite fast, of which now immediately a more.

It is said of the leopard: "He had four wings, like a bird, on his back. The Parder has not merely two wings, like the birds and the first beast, v. 4, but four, like some Jnsectes, but they are feathered, like the birds. Some understand these four wings of four especially praiseworthy virtues of the third kingdom; others of the four regions of heaven which it subdued; L. Osiander of four persons by whom it was chiefly extended; Gerhard and Delitzsch of four kings of it; but Geier, Caspari, and

Others of great, greatest possible speed. The latter will probably be meant here, if not exclusively, then primarily. Already above, where we dealt with the eagle's wings, we saw that speed is symbolized by wings, as is also found among the Greeks, whose Hermes has either wings on his feet or a hat with wings. By "flying" we also designate a very rapid movement. So here the wings will probably mean speed, and, because there are four of them, a great one, even greater than that which was found in the first kingdom.

This also fits very well to the Macedonian-Greek empire, especially under Alexander, as history teaches. After Alexander, in a little more than a year and a half after his accession, had secured himself against his enemies in the empire, had overcome several barbarian peoples of the Macedonian north, had coerced the Greeks into giving him the unrestricted command of the Persian war, and had then completed his armaments for his great campaign, he set out in the early year of 334 B.C. with a small army of 30,000 men on foot and 5,000 on horseback to fight the great Persian empire. He had already crossed the Hellespont before the Persian fleet, which was to hold him out, arrived there. Soon he fought the battle of Granicus, the victorious outcome of which put all Asia Minor on this side of the Taurus into his hands. Having secured this territory without delay, he defeated the Persians at Issus in November 333 B.C., and his rapid movements in particular brought him victory. By this victory all the remaining Persian maritime provinces came under his control. While Parmenio took Syria, Alexander subdued Phoenicia, Palestine and Egypt. Since in the meantime the Persian fleet had been destroyed by his naval commander, he quickly arranged the administration of Egypt and moved from Memphis to Phoenicia in 331 BC. After he had punished the rebellious Samaria on the way, sent a fleet from Tyre against Sparta, and made various changes in the administration of subjugated countries, he set out for Euphxat. On October 1, the battle of Gaugamela and Arbela took place, where the fate of Asia was decided. Alexander was victorious, the Persian Empire his inheritance, which he now had to subdue in detail. Babylon fell into his hands, soon also Susa. After he had stormed the Persian bottlenecks, he hurried with his army to Persopolis so quickly that they did not yet know anything about the storming of the passes. He now quickly subdued Persis and hastened after Darius to Media, whereby the speed of his march is to be particularly mentioned. After he had subdued Media, Parthia, and Hyrcania, it took him a little longer to seize Aria. But already with the onset of winter in 330 B.C. he was master not only of this territory, but Drangiana, Gedrosia, and Arachosia also obeyed him. According to

of some winter rest at the foot of the Indian Caucasus, he made the bold mountain crossing, which is one of the most famous in history, and already after a fortnight his army stood in the fruit plains of Bactria, which submitted to the Oxus without resistance. A flying bridge carried his army across that stream, and even Sogdiana had to acknowledge him as master. Even the Scythians made alliances of friendship with him, which they broke, however, when he was endangered by a revolt in the Oxus country. Then he quickly conquered the seven border fortresses on the Jaxartes, built the border fortress of Alexandria eschata in twenty days to restrain the Scythians, and pursued these his enemies into the desert, so that they soon offered their submission. After repeatedly suppressing disturbances in Sogdiana and the Oxus country, and for the uplift of the latter, which was particularly broken up, he built twelve cities in the same, he commenced his march to India. In the late spring of 327 B.C. he set out with an army of 120,000 men; a year later he was at the Indus, and the territory between the Cophene and the Indus belonged to his empire. In the early year of 326 B.C. he conquered the whole upper Jndusgebisst; soon the kingdom of Porus, which lay beyond the Hydaspes and extended to the Hydraortes, and also the further territory reaching to the Hyphasis, was conquered. Encouraged by his Macedonians, he returned to the Hydaspes in the same year, sailed down the Acesines at the end of October on an assault fleet of 2000 vehicles built underneath, and subdued the Mallerians and Oxydracians on the way. In 325 B.C. he set out on the river Indus proper, subduing the Sogdians and other peoples on the way and occupying the Jndus delta. While Nearch sought the sea route to the mouth of the Euphrates on Alexander's behalf, Alexander made his way back through Gedrosia. From here he moved to Media, arranged a number of things there, and used the rest of the year 324 B.C. for a mountain campaign against the Cossaeans, whom he defeated within 40 days. In the following year he was occupied with a plan aimed at the gradual conquest of Arabia. But when the preparations for this Arabian campaign were completed, he fell ill. On the evening of June 8, 323 B.C., Alexander the Great died in the 33rd year of his life, the most active known to history. - This overview shows with what right the Greek-Macedonian empire is ascribed speed. Indeed, in this respect hardly any other empire equals it. - But let us now consider the further description of Parden.

The text continues: "And the same beast had four heads". There is nothing to prevent us from assuming that the beast had only one head at first, but that it was soon replaced by the four mentioned, for as Daniel himself indicates in chapter 7, 1 (in Hebrews), he only summarized the most important part of the vision. It then became here a similar-

In the same way, the author concealed an event such as that described in chapter 8, namely, that the he-goat, which is the symbol of the Macedonian-Greek empire, grew four horns in place of the one that had been broken off.

What is now probably symbolized by these four heads? Geier thinks, either four main parts of the empire or four simultaneous kings of the same, which latter is assumed by L. Osiander, Gerhard, Calov, Caspari and probably almost without exception by all newer interpreters. Luther, in his preface to the prophets Daniel, understands the four heads of four kingdoms, which arose out of the original united kingdom. Now, at first, the heads of simultaneous kings will probably be understood; for if the beasts signify kingdoms, and their heads are supposed to have a special meaning, we are justified in thinking at first of the head of the kingdom, the regent. This conception is supported by Judges. 10, 18. Isa. 7, 8. cf. with v. 1., confirms it. But it will not be wrong, if we then understand not only the four first kings, but also their kingdoms, as it is said in Cap. 7, 17: "These four great beasts are four kingdoms" (according to the Hebrew: "kings"), while v. 23 shows that not the kings, but their kingdoms are symbolized by the four beasts. -

To which kings and empires now we are here referred, in this the commentators do not quite agree. Vulture mentions Antipater, Antigonus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy; Grotius names Perdiccas, Seleucus, Meleagar, and Ptolemy; Calov names Ptolemy, Seleucus, Philip, and Antigonus. Luther names as the four kingdoms "Syria, Egypt, Asia, Graecia"; but more recent commentators, so Hengstenberg, Egypt, Syria, Tbracia, and Macedonia. We shall have to agree with the latter view as the one most in keeping with history; for only the four who stood at the head of these empires permanently bore the title of king! But let us hear the story recently.

With Alexander the Great also the unity of his empire died. The appearance of the unity of the empire was tried to be preserved for a while, but it finally vanished when Alexander's son, Alexander, who was born after him, was murdered by Cassander. The struggles already begun were continued; Antigonus first fought Seleucus, but succeeded so little against him that the latter became lord of Upper Asia. Then the same Antigonus fought against Ptolemy in the Lyric War. When Antigonus, after a victory in this war, had the title of king conferred upon him, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander also assumed it. Thus, there were now five kingdoms, which had emerged from the former empire of Alexander. When Antigonus refrained from further unsuccessful attempts against Ptolemy, but turned against Cassander, the latter brought about a coalition of the four kings with the purpose of destroying the power of Antigonus. This

This also happened when Antigonus lost both battle and life in 301 B.C. Lei Jpsus and his kingdom fell to the victors as booty. Thus, through various battles, four empires were formed from the one founded by Alexander, and it is these empires with their kings that are symbolized by the four heads of Parden, namely: the Thracian empire under Lysimachus, who ruled over Thrace, the southern coast of Asia Minor as far as the Taurus, the Weft Provinces, Phrygia on the Hellespont, the greater part of Greater Phrygia, Paphlagonia and Pontus; the Macedonian empire under Cassander, who ruled over Macedonia, Thessalonia, Boeotia, Euboea and Cilicia; the Syrian empire under Seleucus, which extended from the Mediterranean to the Indus and Jaxartes; finally, the Egyptian empire under Ptolemy, whose rule extended beyond Egypt to Phoenicia and Cœlesyria, Cyrene and Cyprus.

Let us now look at the last words of our text dealing with this kingdom, which read: "And power was given unto him. Already Cap. 2, 39. it is similarly said, "It shall reign over all the earth." These words need no further explanation, nor is it necessary to show how they were fulfilled in the Macedonian-Greek empire. From what has already been said, it is sufficiently evident what great power and extent the empire had, not only under Alexander, but also under his successors. But when we speak of a dominion "over all lands" or Heb, "over the whole earth," this is to be understood synecdochically of the greatest part of the earth known at that time. In fact, these words cannot be understood of any other kingdom.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

In defense of Christianity.

We Christians have a threefold battle to fight: against the devil, against the world, and against our flesh. The first battle is without question the hardest. Eph. 6, 10. ff. speaks of it. That we stand in it, in a very similar way to the apostles, is obvious. For this battle we need the armor of righteousness (Eph. 6:14) and the shield of faith (Eph. 6:16); the fire arrows of the devil bounce off them like the wooden arrows of little boys off a stone. But above all we need the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. As the Lord in the wilderness rebuked the devil with nothing else than the written word of God (Matth. 4, 4. 7. 10.) We do not need apologetics to fight against the devil. The second

But Kämpe, who is against flesh and blood, is led with the same weapons as that first one, namely with God's word (Joh. 17, 17.) by faith (Acts 26, 18.). We do not need apologetics for this either. The people who write apologetics are therefore not the most supported.

But we need them for our third battle: to fight against the world. Not to convert the world, for no one else does that but the Holy Spirit, and that again through the Word, but to keep it at bay. This is how the ancient apologists understood their task, this is how Justin and Tertullian argued, this is how Richard Bentley and Joh. A. Fabricius argued. They used every worldly science they could command to show the groundlessness of all non-Christian positions and to victoriously repel the objections with which the world seeks to disgrace God's Word.

Since the days of Bahrdt, of course, it has become customary to understand something quite different by apology of Christianity. One wants - oh ridiculous conceit - to prove Christianity. A journal has come into being - written, by the way, by well-meaning persons - which bears the title: "The Proof of Faith." One thinks in all seriousness that Christianity can be demonstrated.

Strikingly Lessing remarks about such apologetics (Lachmann-Maltzahn IX, 282. 283.): "These men (Zöckler and others) have made such great strides in the knowledge of religion for twenty or thirty years, that when I open an older dogmatist against them, I feel as if I were in a completely foreign country. They have so many urgent reasons of faith, so many incontrovertible proofs of the truth of the Christian religion at hand, that I cannot wonder enough how anyone could ever be so short-sighted as to take faith in this truth for a supernatural effect of grace. All that I find in those older dogmatists merely as probable suppositions, as *praejudicia*, as *praescriptiones, which* can move a non-Christian not to reject the Christian religion so badly, but to subject himself to a serious examination of it; everything with which, in former times, the objections of unbelievers and idols were merely dismissed; in short, everything of which it is sincerely confessed in all places that it can neither individually nor collectively work a reassuring conviction, all these have ... they... ...so interlocked... that only the most wilful blindness, only the most wilful obstinacy, cannot confess itself convicted. Now what the Holy Spirit will or can do about it, that is up to him: but truly, if he will not do anything about it, it is just that."

And what is the result of such demonstrations? Does it make God's word more believable? Certainly not. On the contrary, it will be more credible with the-

The evidence is usually so thoroughly falsified on this occasion that it is hardly recognizable. Mr. Marheineke, for example, wanted to prove the Holy Trinity philosophically. But what did he prove? This alone, that every person has three relations (being-in-itself, being-for-itself, and being-in-and-for-itself.) The real Trinity was thereby completely lost to him. And Mr. Zezschwitz? Wants to prove the biblical doctrine of the soul. And what is the result? He proves Aristotle's. Let us not deceive ourselves: the Christian doctrine cannot be proved at all; on the contrary, it runs directly counter to our corrupted reason. But we can keep the enemies of our most holy faith at bay. And this is precisely the task of apologetics.

Everyone who has ever read newspapers or attended popular meetings will know how necessary such art is. What do I say, people's meetings attended - anyone who has intercourse with living people. For it is not possible today to ride on a steamboat or to eat in a boarding-house without being injected with the poison of unbelief. And there it is indeed quite necessary to defend one's skin.

But this is done in two ways: by examining the standpoints of our opponents and by defending our own. The first way is perhaps the most effective. For if it turns out that our enemies' fortresses are made of cardboard, there is nothing left for us but a few rocks that are not flooded by the sea. But there are fifteen fortresses from which our enemies mock the witness of the living God. Some say: sensual experience is the source of truth, therefore the Bible is a book of lies. Others: Let the source of truth be our reason. Still others: Public opinion. Still others: Conscience. The late Schleiermacher: religious feeling. The Catholics: The church. The Greeks: The tradition. The Jesuits: The Pope. Still Others: The Koran. The Jews: The Talmud. The Indians: The Vedas. Other pagans: Buddah. The Chinese: The Shu-King. The Persians: The Zend-Avesta. Most of our countrymen in Europe: nothing. And this last point of view is by far the most convenient. For the Muhamedans have, after all, one place where they are vetvulnerable, that is their Koran; the Chinese no less so. Even the monkey-professor can be embarrassed if he is asked to turn a monkey into a man by beating him or by applying philosophy, for he who accepts sensual experience alone as the basis of knowledge. These happy people, the nothing people, on the other hand, have no vulnerable point; no house that they defend; no spring from which they drink. They are at the same time the most consistent, the worthy descendants of the murderers of Alamuth. On their shield stands their great foundation-

sentence: "Nothing is true and everything is permitted". We must also deal with them.

As far as materialism is concerned, that is, the point of view for which all truth flows from the experience of the senses, it is most decisively represented by Moleschott, Burmeister, Carl Vogt, and Büchner. In particular, the latter has brought to light a kind of catechism of the materialistic system under the title: "Kraft und Stoff, empirischnaturphilosophische Studien" (Leipzig 1855. 8vo. ed. IX. 1867). A second recent writing by the same author (Sechs Vorlesungen über die Darwinsche Theorie. Leipzig 1868. 8vo.) is less important. Carl Vogt's books are very numerous. That of 1855 (Köhlerglaube und Wissenschaft) is still the most noteworthy. The one on man (Giessen 1863) is more important.

Among the refutations we single out that of Fabri (Briefe gegen den Materialismus 1856. sä. II. 1864.). The latest refutation of materialism from the spiritualistic (not Christian) standpoint is that of Naumann (die Naturwissenschaft und der Materialismus, Bonn 1869. 8vo.).

The materialists are not satisfied with placing the five senses on the throne for the realm of the five senses, but rather deny the existence of any other realm. They want to make the five senses of the individual the sole source of all truth for that individual. On this account they deny the existence of the holy angels, the existence of God, and even the existence of the human soul. Of course, they also deny miracles, the creation from nothing, and the resurrection of the flesh. On the other hand, they assert the eternity of matter. But it is composed of a very definite number of atoms, which by accidental (not purposefully directed) combination have produced first the inorganic, then the lower organic, and finally human life. But we would rather let Mr. Büchner speak for himself.

"Force is not a thrusting god"-so he *) declares-"not an essence of things separate from the material basis; it is an inseparable property of matter, inherent in it from eternity." "Matter is not like a carriage, before which the forces, as horses, can now be harnessed, then unharnessed. An iron particle is and remains reliably the same thing, no matter whether it traverses the circle of the world in a meteor stone, smashes along the rails in a steam car wheel, or runs through the temple of a poet in a blood cell. These qualities are of eternity, they are inalienable, untransferable." †) On the fifth page sei-

*) Kraft und Stoff. Leipzig 1867. p. 1.

†) Force and Substance, p. 1. 2.

n his writing, Büchner further denies the creation out of nothing and asserts the immortality of matter. A nothing, he declares, is not merely a logical but also an empirical unding. The world or the substance with its properties, which we call forces, had to be from eternity and will have to be for eternity - in a word, the world cannot be created. (And) that the world is not governed, but that the movements of the substance obey a perfect necessity of nature, founded in itself, from which there is no exception, - what educated man, and especially what man even superficially acquainted with the acquisitions of the natural sciences, would today doubt this truth?" And page 7 he declares again, "The world cannot be created, it is eternal. What cannot be separated could never exist separately! That which cannot be destroyed could not be created! Matter is uncreatable, as it is indestructible." In another place he instructs us, "Force can neither be created nor destroyed-a proposition from which follows the immortality of force and the impossibility of its having a beginning or an end. The consequence of this newly discovered truth of nature is the same as that drawn from the immortality of matter, and both together constitute from eternity and into eternity that sum of phenomena which we call the world. The cycle of matter is paralleled by the cycle of force as a necessary correlate, and teaches us that nothing comes into being and nothing disappears, and that the mystery of nature rests in an eternal circle carried in and through itself, in which cause and effect are linked endlessly and without beginning. "*) Matter, however, according to Mr. Büchner, consists of atoms. "We call an atom," he oracularly says, "a smallest part of matter, which we imagine to be no longer divisible or no longer dividing, and we imagine all matter to be composed of such atoms and to exist and preserve its properties through their mutual repulsion and attraction. **) For this reason, too, our great Doctor declares "that matter is not subordinate to spirit, but on a par with it," yes, he calls upon us to share a certain enthusiasm for matter with him, ††) But as regards the laws according to which matter is active, Herr Büchner calls them eternal and unchangeable. "A rigid, inexorable necessity rules the mass. (Yes) the law of nature is the strictest expression of necessity. Here there is neither an exception nor a restriction, and no conceivable power is capable of overriding this inevitability,

*) Force and Substance, p. 21.
**) Force and Substance, p. 25.
†) Force and substance. S. 29.
††) Force and Substance, p. 35.

Which know neither morality nor temper. No hand keeps the earth in its swing, no commandment makes the sun stand still or quiets the fury of the warring elements, no call awakens the sleep of the dead, no angel frees the prisoner from his dungeon, no hand from the clouds gives bread to the hungry, no sign in the sky grants supernatural knowledge." *)

This view of the world is described by its originators as a manifest progress, indeed as the greatest progress that we have made in this century. Furthermore, it is associated with the progress that observation and knowledge of nature have made in this century. But both of these are stupid and impudent lies, for this very worldview is nothing but the most crass paganism. Not the refined one that we encounter in Plato's dialogues, but the old crass paganism.

"Most of the oldest philosophers," says Aristotle, "believed that the origin of all things was to be sought in matter. For everything that exists consists of matter; in matter it has its first origin, and in matter it finally dissolves again; the matter remains, but its form changes. Therefore they say that matter is the foundation and the original source of things." †) Among these oldest philosophers Aristotle understands, among others, Anaximander and his pupil Anaximenes of Miletus; probably also Heraclitus of Ephesus. The latter, at least, says: "Neither one of the gods nor one of men created the universe, but it always was and is and will be an eternal living fire that takes and consumes forms. ‡) The same cabbage was subsequently warmed up by Democritus of Abdera, only that he added some sentences concerning the atoms. For the third time the Greeks were served this wretched food by Epicurus of Athens, a younger contemporary of Alexander the Great. For he believed that the so-called atoms, that is, certain indivisible corpuscles, tumble about in unlimited empty space, in which there is neither above nor below, neither middle nor end, in such a way that they can be traced by

*) Force and Substance, p. 37.

†) *Των δη πρώτων φιλοσοφησάντων οί πλείστοι τάς έν ύλης εΐδει μόνας ωτρ3-ησα.ν αργάς είναι πάντων ου γάρ ίατιν απαντα τά οντα χα~1 ες ου γίγνεται πρώτου ζαι εις* δ φθείρεται *τελευταΐον) της μεν ουσίας ύπομενοόσης, τοίς δε πάΰεσιν μεταβαλλοβσης, τούτο στοιχείον χα'ί ταΰτην αργήν φασι είναι των οντων.* Aristotle's Metaphysics A. 3.

Κόσμον τον αυτόν απάντων ουτι τις #εών ούτε ανθρώπων έποίησεν, άλλ' ήν άε'ι χαί εστιν χα} εσται πυρ άειζώον, άπτόμενον μέτρα χαι άπο- σβεννυμενον μέτρα. Herulcleitos uxuä Elemeutem XlexLnärivum. Ktroiu.V

) p. 599 B.)

their meeting with each other. Thus all that is there comes into being, and this movement of the atoms never began, but is from eternity.*) After this came Lucrez. Titus Lucretius Carus was a contemporary of Cicero and Caesar. He died on the day on which Virgil was born. He expressed his principles in his famous doctrinal poem *de natura rerum.* There it is said: "When human life on earth lay miserable, almost crushed by the burden of religion, which showed its head from heaven and oppressed mortals with its terrible sight: then first the Greek dared to raise his eyes against it, first dared to confront it. "**) And in another place: "Our supreme principle is: never was anything created by God from nothing." †) But just as little as matter has ever come into being, just as little can it ever pass away, ††) rather it consists of immortal atoms. These move through themselves, from which all change arises. And these wretches dare to present this cabbage, which has been spit out four times, to us for the fifth time! Not only do they dare to present it to us, but at their request we are also to certify that it is a new dish. But how little these dreams, as silly as they are ungodly, flow from the progress of the observational sciences, is shown by the fact that they arose in times when the observation of nature was still in diapers.

(Conclusion follows.)

A literary curiosity

is the antichrist tract by Jacob Andreas Brennecke, published in 1819 without indication of the place of printing: "Biblical proof that Jesus after his resurrection lived bodily on earth for another seven and twenty years.

---

*) Hie (Democritus et secundum eum Epicurus) atomos quas appellat, id est corpora individua propter soliditatem censet in infinito inani, in quo nihil nec summum nec infimum nec medium nec ultimum nec extremum sit, ita ferri ut concursionibus inter se cohaerescant, ex quo efficiantur ea, quae sint quaeque cernantur omnia, eumque motum atomorum nullo a principio, sed ex aeterno tempore intelligi convenire. Cicero de finibus, 1, 6.

**) Humana ante oculos foede cum vita jaceret

and continued to work in silence for the good of mankind. In honor of Jesus, recommended to all theologians for serious consideration by Jacob Andreas Brennecke. 1819."

The motto of this neat work of art comes from the writings of the so-called Sage of Sanssouci and reads: "The most lively pleasure that a reasonable man can have in the world is to discover new truths; the next after this is to get rid of old prejudices. If we communicate to our readers here the most interesting aspects of the contents of the above-mentioned Schrist, it is not because we find pleasure in serving up the expositions of a mad schoolmaster, but because the explanation of the Bible given by Mr. Schenkel and his associates is no different from that given by Mr. Brennecke. Nnr that Herr Brennecke mixes in a little less philosophical nonsense. Mr. Brennecke begins with the proof that man can do many things, but he cannot fly. Admittedly, some people have claimed that they could. Thus of the artist "Daidalos", of Prince Bellerophon and of the artist Degen in Vienna. Likewise of Jesus of Nazareth. Of the same it is asserted that he ascended bodily to heaven. But can this also be proved from the New Testament? Mr. Brennecke now "examines" the reports that belong here. First 1 Petr. 3, 22: "Who has ascended into heaven at the right hand of God, and angels and mighty men and powers are His subjects. Mr. Brennecke, of course, translates: "Who, after his departure into heaven, has taken part in the divine dignity, and has been exalted above all heavenly powers. Our scholar then considers the words of the original language:

Πορεν^ειζ ei? ουρανόν - so he begins - "since he entered heaven." Had Petros written, *όχη^είς,^* it would read:
has gone up to heaven. But to go up to heaven does not mean to fly up with the body into the air, into heaven, for the dust must return to the earth as it was, but the spirit must return to God who gave it, says Solomon. Petros knew this also, therefore to go up to heaven in this verse is to die. The meanest man knows this when he sings:

> Christ's blood and righteousness
> Shall be my ornament and my garment of honour; With this I will stand before God, When I enter heaven.

Eti ουρανόν, by the way, also means: to the unknown land, you know...
not where. *Άναβαίν ειν είζ τόν ουρανόν,* to go up to heaven,
means: to discover sublime religious truths. Since fog also means heaven, τοορεύεό^αι *είζ τόν ουρανόν* αηφ also means: to go away in fog.

Of course, the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is the most difficult for Mr. Brennecke. Lucas says - our author notes - in clear words that Jesus led his disciples from Jerusalem to Bethany. Here, as we know from several passages in the Euaggelia (Mr. Brennecke loves to speak half-Greek, which was "scientific" in those days), he had guest-friends, with whom he stopped when he traveled to Hierusalem for a feast. Lazaros, as we know, was the name of the owner of this panty, and Martha and Mary were the names of his sisters. All three loved him. Lazaros, buried too soon, he had brought back to himself. How sorry Jesus would have been to these three grateful hearts if he had not spoken to them now that he was about to depart for some time, and perhaps far, for the sake of his personal safety! They sat down, or rather camped themselves, according to the custom of the time, and enjoyed a little refreshment, which the busy Martha handed around. One or the other had something to say or ask. Jesus gave the information. The main subject of his conversation was the moral kingdom of God; and the last question of his disciples was, "Will you also restore the Israelitish kingdom? Jesus answered, Only God knows if and when this will be done. You need not be anxious about that. But you shall also come to right views about it. Until then, only teach in all the world what I have taught you. Now he made a movement to stand up. Since all eyes were upon him (*βλεπόντων αυτών),*
so out of courtesy they hastened to his aid. He was lifted up, or: he rose, got up, got ready to go. The Orientals [sic!] like to sit. But as they do not sit in so comfortable a manner as we do, it is a polite custom with them for the inferior to help up the superior, the younger the older, the host his guest. Jesus was the main person in this society. How could one have failed to reach out to him and lend a hand, especially since he had not yet fully recovered from the crucifixion and still felt a little weak? [That Jesus rose from his seat or had himself lifted up in the house of his host friend Lazaros is therefore indicated by the word , but not by a hovering or flying out by
The people of Bethany were not forgotten that the company was in Bethany, where Jesus had led them. For it must not be forgotten that the company was in Bethany, whither Jesus had led them, as Lucas expressly says in Cap. 24, v. 50. of his Euaggelion. *Έ^ήχαχε δέ αντον^ έα> ζ είζ Βη^ανίαν.* From the Morgenländer love to the
Sitting is frequently found in the Bible. The poets even make their God sit. Frequently they speak of his chair. David says Psalm 29:10: The Lord sitteth to make a flood of sin. - If David wants to get him to do something, he usually addresses him with the words: Stand up,

Lord! arise, open up! Psalm 7, 7. 21, 14. 44, 27. 94, 2. In the New Testament, too, we have already come across many examples of this kind. There Jesus sits under God's mighty hand. And more recent travel writers tell us that even shield-guards sit at their posts with their legs crossed under them. What Oriental, then, could have strayed at the word to the thought that Jesus flew up from his cushion into all the air, went up to heaven? Only westerners, ignorant of the customs of the morning, have strayed there.

The lifted up Jesus εύλόχηδεν *αύτούζ,* ίνοΓΗίφ, i.e.. ready to travel) now took leave, εύλόχηδεν *αύτούζ,* ίνοΓΗίφ literally: he blessed them, Luc. 24, 51. and every friendly farewell, every farewell, Be well, God be with you, God keep you! is a blessing. He then departed from them, διέδτη *άπ' αυτών,* Luc. 24, 51. He went to the room and home and went on his way. His friends politely accompanied him out into the open air and, moved, looked after him with blessings as long as they could see him. This, however, was not very far, for fog gradually withdrew him from their sight. *Καί νεφέλη ύπέλαβεν αυτόν τών οφθαλμών αυτών,* Acts 1, 9. If Lucas. should not contradict itself, the words are, *Καί άνεφέρετο είζ τόν ουρανόν* (Luc. 24, 51.): and he disappeared in the mist, in the thick haze. Bon of a cloud, νήφοζ, which lifted him aloft or into the air, *είζ ύψοζ η είζ αέρα άνενεγκών αυτόν, there* is not the least thing in the original language of the primordial document of good Lucas. *Νεφέλη* with German book.

Nevele is the name of the High German word Nebel. Which linguist is not aware that we have in the German language a great many words borrowed from the Greek? Albanus, the learned linguist of Riga, who is well known, has already published a thousand such words in print. It is true that they have suffered small changes in the mouths of the Germans, as is the case with all foreign words when they are incorporated into our language. For example, only a few: μέλκα, milk; νύρα, a door; νήρ, a beast; κάμινοζ, a chimney; πούζ, a foot; πόδεζ, Paws, feet; κλαίω and κλάω, I lament, weep;; πατήρ, a father; the Old German word is Teuto. The same case is with the word νεφέλη, fog. The Old Germans and Platt Germans say Miest instead of Nebel; and Mist is what the English call the fog; the Anglo-Saxons brought this old German word to England with them. So Jesus wandered away on foot according to the narrative of Lucas; for πορεύεδναι means on foot. travel. From οχεϊδναι, to drive, or πέτεδναι, *ϊπταδναι, to* fly, είζ *ύψοζ,* into the air, or είζ *άέρα,* into the air, is not at all mentioned in his narrative. And fog gradually eluded him from their eyes, Lucas says most definitely. Of a cloud, he knows nothing, and says nothing. Of a stnrmwind, *άνεμοζ τυφώνικόζ, χειμών,* which carried away Jesus-

he knows and says just as little. If it had been windy, there would have been no thick fog on the ground. Jesus, fearing discovery, had used night and fog to leave Jerusalem unrecognized. Several times he had visited and left his disciples in this way, as the Euaggel lists tell us. -

The narrative of Jesus' departure is actually closed with the words: and mist by and by withdrew him from their sight. But Lucas thinks it good to add a few more words: Though they now looked after him with unblinking looks into the mist, ὡί *άτενίζοντες ηβαν εϋ τόν ουρανόν,* Lucas here calls the mist into which Jesus wandered, Heaven. A proof that he, as we also do, counted mists to heaven. Jesus had also done this before him, as we see from Marc. 14, 62: You will see him coming with mists of heaven *(όψε^ε ερχόμενον μετά των νεφελών του ουρανούς* i. e. you will see him coming from
of his concealment come forth again quite undaunted. Now further: while he was now wandering *(πορευομένου αυτού),* there came to them two men clothed in white *(ανδρεζ δύο τίαρειδτήκ^^αν άυτοϊζ εν εδ- ^ητι λευκή).* These men, too, call the turbid thick air which Lucas
as an honest man by her right name, in order to prevent misunderstandings, commonly called heaven. This, as we have shown above, is a very ambiguous word. Had these men been historians, as Lucas was, they would have used a certain expression in order to be less misunderstood. But accuracy in the choice of words was not their business. The apostles, who had before them the mist which they called heaven, understood it sufficiently. So do we. But that the common man may understand them aright, it is the duty of the translator, according to the rules of the doctrine of translation, to substitute their indefinite expressions for more definite ones, that their opinion may be rightly apprehended. They saw Jesus walking in the mist as well as the apostles. They therefore meant the mist when they called it heaven. According to their opinion, therefore, we translate dutifully what they said, namely, Galilians! Why then do ye stand looking so earnestly, so persistently into the mist? This Jesus, who has disappeared from you into the mist, has not disappeared forever; calm yourselves and know that just as he has now gone away in the mist, so he will also come again in the mist. - In this way they comforted the downcast disciples, and the consequence taught that they spoke the truth, and the same Lucas who here describes Jesus' going away in the night and fog, tells us also that Jesus came again several times in the same manner, soon to one, soon to another of his disciples, as we have already seen in the history of Peter and Paul, and consequently need not repeat. *Sapienti satis.*

(Submitted.)

Literary Intelligences.

Eternal life presented to the "strangers and pilgrims" by A. Brauer, pastor at Garwitz. Given to the mission by the author. Hermannsburg. Printed and published by the Mission House. 1868. 8vo.

The German book market is literally flooded with books concerning life after death. And with how wretched books! We only recall the poetry of Herr Splittgerber. We are all the more glad to be able to announce a book which seeks nothing more than to set forth clearly the pure teaching of the Word of God concerning these things. First, the author introduces us to the expressions by which the Scriptures designate eternal life. He names twenty-four such expressions, namely: fatherland, eternal tabernacles, barn (Matth. 3, 12.), Abraham's bosom, the holy (Hebr. 10, 19.), Jerusalem above, paradise, the house of the heavenly Father, and heaven. Other expressions describe the state of the blessed: Peace, rest, refreshment, one Sabbath after another (Isa. 66, 22. 23.), eternal glory (1 Pet. 5, 10.), the kingdom of the Father, the crown of honors (1 Pet. 5, 3. 4.), life (Matt. 7, 14.), filiation (Rom. 8, 23.), and inheritance. To these are added the figurative expressions of a fair pasture, a banquet, a wedding, a day of rest; and the name which St. Peter's Epistle 2 Cap. 3. verse 13. uses: new heaven and new earth. The writer now enters more fully into the description of eternal life, and first describes the absence of all evils in eternal life. And here our readers will no doubt be especially pleased to find among the proofs, besides the texts of the Revelation of John, the lovely descriptions of the prophet Isaiah. The same descriptions which the Chiliastes have so shamefully abused, Isa. 32, 17. 18.: "The fruit of righteousness shall be peace, and the profit of righteousness shall be everlasting quietness and safety; that my people may dwell in houses of peace, in secure habitations, and in proud rest." And Isa. 35:9: "There shall no lion be there, neither shall any ravening beast tread thereon, nor be found there; but one shall walk there freely, securely." Further, the writer describes the beauty of the heavenly abode, and the glory of the transfigured bodies; for they shall be light and bright as the sun, like the angels that shine there like lightning. Yes, they will be glorious, incorruptible, powerful and spiritual. Then the author speaks of the glory of blessed souls and of the goods of communion in eternal life. But he names three such goods: mutual love, mutual honor, and common joy. What in particular

As far as honor is concerned, Pastor B. rightly refers to John 12:26: "He that will serve me," says the Lord, "let him follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant be also. And whosoever serveth me, him shall my Father honour." But whom the Father honors, our author continues, all blessed beings, all angels, and all men, honor him in heaven alike; for in eternal life we shall also "be like God" in the rendering of honor; and since it is now written that God will give "praise and honor" to those who here "have sought eternal life with patience in good works," there, Rom. 2:7; so the pious warrior and victor will also receive praise and honor from all the blessed. And so all will receive from all "the unfading crown of glory."

Lastly, Pastor B. deals with the good of goods, the seeing of God. Finally, he answers two questions: What about the degrees of glory of the elect? and: What influence does the eternal damnation of the wicked have on the blessedness of the blessed? But we do not want to spoil the joy of our readers; they may take the book in hand themselves! They will find that it presents the old, simple truth in a new, lovely garment. And that is desired here, at least among us Missourians. In Germany, of course, such a gift will not be held in high esteem, for it contains none of the foolish antics with which the so-called scholars there deceive their people.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The school controversy in Cinrinnati. For some time now nothing has occupied the minds and the public press here so much as the plan to combine the numerous and large Catholic parochial schools with the public state schools, in that it involves the abolition of the Bible reading hitherto customary in the latter. The Catholics, especially the Irish, who, as one hears, are not able to maintain good schools with the best will in the world, had declared themselves willing to rent their school buildings to the municipal school authorities, on condition, however, that the reading of the Bible, the praying of the Lord's Prayer, and similar devotional exercises in the schools cease. A violent storm now arose against this from other, especially Puritan, sides. Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, &c., zealously opposed it, and a multitude of petitions were sent to the Board of Education, all protesting against the principle of abolishing the reading of the Bible in the schools. At the meetings of the school board, in the presence of a large audience, the question was very stormily argued, but not settled. Now, wisely, the Archbishop of Cincinnati took possession of the situation and moved that a conference be held on the matter. The school board responded by appointing a committee consisting of two Catholics, two Protestants, and two Protestants.

three freethinkers. At first, it seemed as if these conference negotiations would not lead to the desired goal, namely the unification of the schools, since, strangely enough, a large part of the German Catholics declared themselves against the plan. According to the latest news, however, this opposition has fallen, for reasons that are easy to explain, and papists in alliance with the large group of unchurched freethinkers will now probably also victoriously overcome the opposition of the puritan elements and bring the matter to a head. In the event, the State would once again be thoroughly duped by the Papists. The latter so easily concern themselves with nothing, if they do not lead the sure prospect of extending their sphere of power in the rear. They know quite well that a pure State institution without Bible and Our Father gets along quite well with a pure Papal institution without Bible and Our Father under one roof, indeed that the former will thus most conveniently supply the material for the latter. Behind the mask of state-political consistency, according to which no Bible is tolerated in state institutions, there is therefore nothing but consequent papist church policy, according to which one takes the Word of God from the world and then devours it. Would not the Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and others who have Christian child-rearing at heart, open their eyes and establish proper parochial schools to serve the kingdom of God? R.

Beretniug om det 10. ordentlige Synodemöde af Synoden for den Norsk Evang.-Luth. Kirke i Amerika. 96 p. 8.

This year's Synodal Report of our Norwegian brethren has been published under this title and is available from Prof. K. Bergh Decorah, Iowa, for the price of 25 Cts. Whoever is able to speak Norwegian should purchase it. For, in addition to the excellent speech of the Synod and the interesting annual report of Herm Präs. Preus, it contains a detailed treatment of the doctrine of the Scripture principle and the correct rules of Scripture interpretation, negotiations on church discipline, detailed reports on the teaching institution of the Synod, and other things. - According to the same, the Synod was assembled at Spring Grove, Houston Co., Minn. from June 19 to 27 of this year. In attendance were: 135 voting members - 39 pastors, and 96 congregational deputies, - and 26 advisory, namely 5 professors, 3 pastors, 5 school teachers, and 13 guests. Newly admitted were: 7 pastors, 1 professor, 1 school teacher, and 5 congregations. The whole Synod consists of 130 congregations with 63 pastors and professors. C.

Sign of the times. According to the report of the "New York Independent" two thirds of the students of the seminary of the Episcopal Church there have recently converted to the Roman Catholic Church. This institute is said to be under the complete control of the High Church. L. L.

II. Abroad.

The narrower conference of the "General Lutheran Conference" in Braunschweig on April 7 of this year had, among other things. among other things, passed the resolution: "Although the provisions for the General Lutheran Conference in the entrance state as the purpose of the Conference to bring the members of the various Lutheran church regions of Germany closer together for the cultivation of their fellowship and for the understanding of their common interests, - and although it is not to be denied, that the Lutheran brethren in the Prussian Regional Church do not belong to a "Lutheran church prayer," they may nevertheless, for the sake of their personal confession, be members of the Conference according to § 2 of the regulations, and because of this Lutheran confession it is also recognized as permissible to admit someone from among them to the further committee.

take." The church bulletin of the Breslau Separate Lutherans reports the following about the various receptions of this resolution: "A Mecklenburg correspondent in the Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt (No. 18. p. 71.) has expressed himself in complete and unconditional agreement with this resolution:

The Brunswick Assembly in matters of the Lutheran Conference decided in the most correct manner on the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Prussian Verein Lutherans, according to the news I have received. As is well known, the question had its danger in that the unconditional exception would have entangled us in our incorrect ecclesiastical position, that we would have said yes to this unfortunate circular quadrature request, which everywhere no longer seems to seek a proper confessional church, but wants to be content with the rights of the Lutherans within the Union and thus strengthens and conserves the Union itself. On the other hand, however, the members of the Union had personally and honestly professed the Lutheran confession, fought for it in their own way, and sought to make it a power in the congregations again. Thus church robbery and personal confession were opposed to each other, and if now, as I hear, the conference has decided to admit them "not because of their church membership and church position, but because of their personal confession," then this is also a correct decision, then this is also a correct decision, about which we can only rejoice, since it must be important to us to maintain fellowship with these brethren as well, and the danger lay only in the false ecclesiastical principle, so eliminated for us, in the evil fiction that one still had a Lutheran church in the midst of the Union. This fiction the Conference has destroyed in its part, and we should thank it for that. In addition, however, not only was Huschke appointed in addition to Arndt, which was of course necessary, but also a narrower (5 persons) and an additional (8 persons) committee was established, and Arndt was not appointed to the narrower committee, but only to this additional committee, so that the actual leadership of the entire matter remains with members of such churches who, by God's grace, have nothing to do with the Union. Thus a decision has been reached that is correct in all respects, and the Lord God will continue to help.

The "Neue Zeitblatt", the organ of Dr. Münkel, who formerly belonged to the managing committee but has now been transferred to the advisory committee, is less satisfied, indeed very dissatisfied, with this decision. The Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt in No. 26 summarizes the most important points from the relevant statements of this newspaper (in No. 20):

Dr. Münkel agrees with the replacement of the 'narrower conference' of 83 members by an advisory committee of 8 men: it is expedient and necessary. The actual list of the members of this committee, which one "provisionally sought to determine" in Brunswick, has not yet been published: this is probably connected with the relationship to the Lutherans of the Regional Church in Old Prussia. As for this 'life question' itself, Dr. Münkel, after having remarked in passing that in Brunswick there was not even a number capable of passing a resolution, explains the great unanimity with which the resolution on it was passed in Brunswick, since the resolution itself was 'glued together out of contradictory sentences. According to the resolution, there should be no Lutheran church prayer in the old Prussian Landeskirche, but it follows from the right of every Lutheran to actively participate in the public meetings that Superintendent Arndt could also serve on the advisory committee. If this conclusion is correct," says Dr. Münkel, "then the other conclusion is also correct, that Superintendent Arndt can serve on the Alusschuß because he has served on the advisory committee. Moreover

will the un-Irish Lutherans, if they respond differently to the proposal, surely not be satisfied with an eighth place on the deliberative committee; they will demand a decent place on the committee? In any case, the provision that members of Lutheran church districts sit in the Conference is not to be upheld if members of non-Lutheran church districts are entitled to sit in the public meetings as well as in the Committee and the Committee; and conversely, as long as that provision is to be read in print, and a United Lutheran sits in the Committee or in the Committee, so long is a Lutheran church prayer recognized within the Union. Dr. Muenkel's opinion, however, is that it would probably have been better to have changed the provision and left the decision of the controversy as to whether Lutheran church prayer is recognized within the Union to the discretion of each individual. "As far as I also know the circumstances, will the unirite Lutherans henceforth keep away from the Conference? If they admit that there is no Lutheran church area within the united church, they would have to give themselves up. On the other hand, the "separated and related or friendly church" would not be satisfied either, but would see in Arndt's appointment to the committee a de facto recognition of what the Brunswick resolution denied in words. Huschke will not come either. One would hardly have any other choice than "to let all of Old Prussia go, if one wants to have 20,000 (sic!) separatists, or to let Huschke go, if one wants to have Arndt. Moreover, the preference given to the Breslau Synod would entitle the other Separates to complain.

The omission then concludes with an admonition to "keep the real situation clear in one's mind and to stretch out one's hands only for what can be achieved", and with the hint for the future that the matter can only work if one takes care "that certain schools or party tendencies do not dominate the conference, of which one wants to feel the beginning already in the Brunswick conference".

From this we see that Dr. Münkel, dissatisfied with the concession shown to us in the resolution, would like to see it amended to the effect that the Vereinslutherans within the Union would not be denied membership in the Lutheran Church, but would be granted even more than they have been granted, namely a place on the governing committee.

The Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt itself also speaks out against the resolution, only in the opposite direction than Dr. Münkel. It is not us who find too much conceded in it, but the Vereinslutheran, whom it would prefer to see removed from the wider committee. In its lengthy discussion of the resolution (in No. 26), it not only calls attention to the questionable consequences of it, - e.g., how the Vereinslutherans might thereby be strengthened in their false position, while many among the former friends of the Conference might be led to renounce it, - but also finds the resolution itself questionable and says:

Arndt's appeal must seem very questionable. It is conceded that those "Lutheran brothers" do not belong to a Lutheran church area, but § 2 of the regulations is applied to them, that every Lutheran is entitled to active participation in the public meetings, if he submits to the regulations by signing them. - Here it might first be recalled that the paragraph does not speak of membership in the committee, but only of active participation in the conference proceedings. But then it must be asked whether it is possible to be a Lutheran without belonging to "a Lutheran church area"? We have never been able to grasp it in any other way than that only he is to be called a Lutheran who belongs to a Lutheran particular church and thus also to the general Lutheran church.

It also argues that everything here depends on what purpose, what issue the conference is actually supposed to have. If one had intended only a kind of larger preachers' conference, that is, a meeting for the theoretical discussion of theological questions and problems, then nothing significant could be remembered against the admission of the Vereinslutherans. If, on the other hand, the intention existed, as one must assume according to the present basic provisions of the Conference, that it would stand up for the good right of the Lutheran Church, which is now being attacked, sometimes by force, sometimes by trickery, sometimes openly, sometimes covertly, on the part of the unchurched Church and its regiment, and would support the individual oppressed Lutherans, and that it should come to the aid of the individual Lutheran regional churches under pressure with advice and action to the best of its ability, then the involvement of those who, even if personally affiliated with the Lutheran confession, nevertheless publicly belonged to the very church that threatened the Lutheran one, could not be justified.

From these communications our readers will gather that the Conference is in danger of perishing from the contradiction between the expressed purpose and the popular composition of its members and leaders, with which it has unfortunately been afflicted from the beginning, if it does not yet succeed in reconciling the two, for which the Lord grant grace."

(Church bulletin for Lutheran congregations of Prussia.)

Oestreich. Krakow. It is well known how a nun, Barbara Ubryk, who had been imprisoned here for 21 years, allegedly for breaking her vows, in a tomb-like, dark and stinking cell of the local Carmelite nunnery, was finally freed by order and with the help of the government and handed over to the most careful care. They found in the unfortunate victim of monastic barbarian discipline a naked, misshapen, half-witted creature, whose horror and pitying sight could even induce the bishop, who had been summoned, to exclaim to the "sisters" (matron and nuns of the convent) standing by: "You are not women, but furies!" The abbess and her deputy were taken into custody together with the confessor of the convent, and the latter was closed. Before that, raging mobs broke the windows of this and other monastery buildings in the city and insulted their occupants. The hatred of the lower classes against the monastery system was subsequently expressed in a very similar way in Prague, Insbruck and even in Berlin. - Now, this Krakow scandal is quite suitable to cast a glaring, but accurate spotlight on the contemplative semi-darkness of monastic life, which has become so attractive again in recent times, even among Protestants, and to present the much praised conservatism in the papacy in its most actual form - has, after all, resulted in two salutary measures in the Austrian states. First, a general visitation of the monasteries, as thorough as possible, in which the Concordat-free state does not allow itself to be deprived of assisting the clergy, and then the following decree of the imperial government:

Vienna, 8 Aug. The Minister of Justice has issued the following decree:

The expulsion of individual priests to a clerical correctional institution, decreed by the bishops in application of their disciplinary power over the members of the clergy subject to them, is compatible with the law of October 27, 1862, enacted for the protection of personal freedom, only to the extent that it orders the non-forced residence of a priest in such an institution and the supervision of him during this stay. October 1862 for the protection of personal freedom only to the extent that it orders the unenforced stay of a priest in such an institution and the supervision of him during this stay, from which it follows that such an episcopal order can only be effective to the extent that and for so long as the priest affected by it voluntarily submits to it. Accordingly, the organs of public authority

in the present state of civil law not authorized to stop and deliver to a clerical correctional institution a priest who has been expelled by his bishop. Hasner.

This announcement is supplemented by the following decree of the Minister of Culture and Education, the Ministers of the Interior and Justice of 7 August of this year.

The principle enunciated in the decree of the Minister for Cultus and Instruction of June 7, 1869, concerning the execution of episcopal decisions ordering the confinement of a priest in an ecclesiastical correctional institution, also applies to all regulars of both sexes, so that no person belonging to a regular community who, for whatever reason, is held in custody by order of the superiors concerned, may be detained therein against his will. Since, however, considerations of humanity and health care may not be disregarded with respect to those persons of the secular priesthood and regulars who voluntarily submit to the imprisonment imposed upon them by their superiors, lists of the secular priests and regulars who are actually in voluntary imprisonment shall be submitted to the Minister of Cultus and Instruction, stating the name, the time since which the imprisonment has lasted, the date of the imprisonment, and the date on which the imprisonment began, the time for which the imprisonment has lasted, the time for which it was imposed, the condition of the place of imprisonment with respect to size, light, air and furnishings, and then the rations, and in the future to be supplemented immediately in the event of new cases.

If the bishops do not undertake to compile such lists with respect to the secular and regular clergy of their diocese and to submit them to the provincial heads with sufficient guarantees for their completeness and the correctness of all information contained therein, the district governors are to compile the aforementioned lists themselves, insofar as they concern the secular priests, but with respect to the regulars they are to request them directly from the boards of directors of the individual convents and congregations, to examine them in detail, to verify them, and to present them in the most diligent manner. This regulation is to be communicated to each new member of a religious order or congregation before he takes his vows, and proof of this is to be presented to the head of the country in each individual case.

The present Ordinance shall take effect on the date of its promulgation. Hasner.

Giskra. Autumn.

It is reported that the government wants to abolish the infamous Carmelite nunnery in Krakow. Would to God it were done with all these dens of vice and chambers of death! R.

From the Anglican Church. The London Catholic weekly, the Weekly Register, reports a considerable number of Anglican clergy determined to attend the Ecumenical Conciliar "in order to lay their difficulties before the assembled Prelates of the whole Church." It is further said that the earnest desire of these gentlemen is to unite with the Catholic Church, and that the main difficulty of their situation is that they consider their priestly ordination to be valid and dare neither to have a new ordination made with them nor, on the other hand, to return to the lay state without hesitation. As a result, a special committee has been set up in Rome to deal with the Anglican orphans, and there is little doubt that the concerns of the Reverend Pilgrims will be settled by this tribunal. As the final outcome of this mission the "Weekly Register" expects the conversion of some of the best and most pious (?) members of the English clergy and many laymen. (Apologet.)

Church Political Pulpit - Compliment. In one of last year's Advent sermons by the well-known Roman pulpit orator Father Hyacinthe in the church of ***Notre Dame in*** Paris, he spoke to a large and select Catholic audience about the Protestants as follows: "By what right, you violent, unjust people, do you want to brand all those who live in Protestantism as children of lies and wickedness? I, for my part, will never approve of such assertions. I have scarcely returned from Protestant England, and I owe the truth the testimony: I have found there not only great citizens, but also great Christians" (perhaps Lord Bute, Dr. Pusey, and others). "You talk to me of partitions: I know them well; yes, I admit myself, there are chasms that divide us. But can not faith move mountains? Can't love fill up chasms? Fierce wars of words and bitter polemics will never restore unity; but love, mercy, the noble virtues of truly Christian hearts, will. Let me reach out to them, press them to my bosom, these Christians who are sincere in their error; who are also sincere in their love to God, to JEsum Christum, and to men, and in this brotherly embrace let me sing my song, "Behold, how fine and sweet it is when brethren dwell together in one accord," if not in the same body, yet in the same soul, in the invisible unity of the Church and of the Lord JEsu." It must be said that these are "sweet words" and "glorious speeches. " R.

Father Hyacinth, the celebrated Roman pulpit orator in Paris, first broke with the Pope and the Conciliar. In an open letter addressed to the Superior of the Order at Rome, he declared his resignation from the monastery and his resignation from the pulpit at Notre Dame in Paris, because he could no longer obey the orders of the Holy See. To this declaration he then added a decisive protest against the outrageous presumptions of the pope against the so-called Syllabus, as well as against the manner of convocation, composition and purpose of the Council, as contrary to the principles of Christianity. This courageous step of the Father has caused the greatest sensation everywhere; on the one hand, joyful surprise, applause, hope to have found in the Father the suitable foreman against the Jesuits; on the other (ultramontane) side, quite embarrassment and ill-concealed anger. The Council will of course sit in judgment on the new heretic, and he himself is said to have the urgent wish to be allowed to answer personally before the assembled prelates. But four French bishops, those of Avignon and Rheims, Chalons and Bayeux, have already offered to defend Father Hyacinth, while Cardinal Matthieu wants to refute Ermö'nche's epistle for the time being. In response to a letter from Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans, who exhorted him in very respectful terms to step back from the crooked and pernicious path he had trodden, and to seek forgiveness, peace, and the restoration of the honor of his life at the feet of the Holy Father for the trouble he had caused, the Father replied as politely as he did firmly that he could accept neither the rebuke nor the well-meant advice. For, he concludes to the bishop, "What you call a great mistake, I call a great duty fulfilled." - It may well be that the protest of Father Hyacinth, who is universally revered in more liberal Catholic circles, combined with the declarations of Catholic conventions in Germany and Hungary, and of such men as Dr. Döllinger and Bishop Carroth, and Count Montalembert, who so long defended the Catholic Church, but has now also declared himself against the papal Syllabus, will spoil some considerable accounts for the pope and his Concile, especially if one adds to this the movements in Austria, Spain, and the United States.

and Mexico. According to the latest news, by the way, the suddenly world-famous Father Hyacinth arrived in New York on October 18 for a visit, in order, as he is said to have said to friends, "to make himself strong in the free air of America for the Conciliar, where he has to fight with the lion in his den. May the good Father succeed in familiarizing himself early enough with the armor in which a Luther once victoriously offered the Roman monster and its tail, the Concil, the point and inflicted mortal wounds on it! Eph. 6, 10-17. - Truly nothing is done with one's own power and other weapons. R.

Russia's confessions. The Orthodox Greek Catholic Church numbers 54 million adherents. Roman Catholics, 2,800,000; Protestants, 1,960,000. The Chysty sect, which believes that every man can become "Christ" through abstinence, numbers about 110,000. Another sect recognizes no political power. The emperor is for them the personified Antichrist, the wandering a creed; nearly a million strong live on the banks of the Volga. Armenians about 500,000, mostly in the Caucasus. Israelites 1,450,000; Muhamedans 5,7000,000; about 500,000 idolaters scattered over the vast expanses of Siberia.

Religious fanaticism in Russia. The "Indiana State Newspaper" writes: It is well known that among the many religious sects with which the Czaarm Empire is abundantly blessed, there is in Russia an almost incredible fanaticism, which, notwithstanding the gratifying progress favored by the government itself, is yet still on the increase. But everything that has existed in this way is eclipsed by an act of Giaubenswuth reported from the government district of Saratov.

A few months ago there appeared in that part of the Russian empire the prophets of a new religious sect, who taught that the only way to the salvation of souls and redemption from sin was self-annihilation by fire, and superstitious rural population, that in one large and populous village no less than 700 persons gathered in a few wooden huts, and after barricading the windows and doors, set fire to themselves and burned themselves in voluntary sacrifice.

We then learn the following from another paper: New and even more ghastly-sounding news is again coming in about the religious insanity of the Scops. For example, the Russian newspaper Don writes: "On the 13th of this month, four hundred Scops from Balashov went to the nearest town to pray and flagellate themselves. Naked, with torn clothes and bloodthirsty bodies, they arrived there, but on the way home things were to get even worse and more savage. One of them, named Wasiloff, declared himself to be God's messenger and Christ in person, and many others proclaimed themselves to be saints after him. They declared that it was necessary to offer human sacrifices, and plucked five individuals from the crowd, threw them between several wooden carts that had fallen over each other, and set the latter on fire. One woman, who had proclaimed herself a holy Paraskina, scourged a maid with a wagon bar so lukewarmly that the latter gave up the ghost. Another woman was literally trampled to death with her feet by the ravagers. In a word, there were atrocities such as the pen is not able to reproduce. The court has already opened an investigation and arrested many of the main culprits.

Great Britain, with a population of about 25 million, has 34,700 churches with 36,200 preachers. Among the 1,200,000 Protestants of France, on the other hand, there are 1100 pastors.

England. The long parliamentary controversy, over the Irish Church Bill, is at last over. The House of Lords and the House of Commons have accepted a compromise proposed by the Government and have resolved all previous differences. On July 26th the royal approval arrived and so the Church Bill is published as law. Henceforth in Ireland neither the Episcopal Church, nor any other, shall be a State Church. In the future only free church communities shall exist. The use of the surpluses of the church property is to be determined and controlled by the parliament. The Irish Catholics, however, expect nothing less than the restitution of all church property, church buildings, etc., which formerly belonged to them. R.

The general Israelite synod at Leipzig, which united the most outstanding representatives of freer Judaism, also from America, dealt primarily with the question of a contemporary reform of education and worship. In the former respect the non-denominational schools were joyfully welcomed. Special emphasis was placed on the fact that religious instruction should not only include biblical history and a compilation of religious principles, but should also strive for familiarity with the Hebrew language and the history of Judaism. The ideal development of the youth was not to be impaired by critical remarks or even to stimulate doubt in the youth, but the school was also not to ignore the results of science in order to prevent emerging contradictions between faith and knowledge. The need for teachers' educational institutions of their own was lively acknowledged, and in particular the founding of a Jewish university was envisaged. With regard to the divine service, the one-year cycle was to be retained for the reading of the five books of Moses, while consideration was to be given to contemporary changes in the prescribed prayers; the request for revenge on the enemies, for the restoration of animal sacrifices, and for a personal return to Jerusalem was desired to be eliminated, just as the introduction of the organ in the divine service was not only considered unobjectionable, but recommendable. (Ref. Kirchztg.)

How the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is further developed in Göttingen can be seen from a lecture given by the Consistorial-Rath and Prof. Schö'berlein at a conference in Berlin. The Prussian-Lutheran MonatsSchrift by Behrends speaks about this lecture as follows: "Consistorial-Rath and Prof. Schöberlein from Göttingen gave a very detailed and profound lecture on the Sacrament of the Altar according to doctrine and practice. After a historical overview, he proved the correctness of the Lutheran doctrine on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, but also reminded us of the necessity of further education, especially in regard to the sacramental effect on the spiritual-natural side. The remarks regarding practice and celebration were similar: the Lutheran Church had the right elements and beginnings here, but they needed further training. Thus the sacrificial side (the offering on the part of the congregation) must be more prominent and an organic connection with the entire worship celebration must be striven for, but in such a way that in reality the whole congregation communicates and not only one part, while the other remains passive. Therefore, it is not recommended to celebrate on Sundays, but rather on fixed days (e.g., high feasts). Concerning the communion of the Lord's Supper, now much discussed, the sentence: "Communion of the Lord's Supper is communion of the church" was held fast, but at the same time the admission of guests was presented as the right thing to do. Christians of all confessions should be able to participate without formal conversion, and in such a way that the admitting church would count it an honor to be able to practice such a service of love, just as freedom of hospitality is a matter of honor in social life.

Baden. Heidelberg. [Confessionless schools.] Great is the Diana of the Heidelbergers-this play was brought to a close amidst roaring applause on June 24. The liberal papers themselves say most naively: we have had a few days of excitement such as we have hardly experienced since 1849. The first act took place on June 22nd, on which day the vote of the "Protestants" on the question whether confessional or non-confessional schools took place and lasted from 9 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Out of 917 members of the Protestant school community, only 7 were against. Already that evening the names of these 7 men could be read on large placards on all street corners. On June 23 followed the second act, the vote of the Catholics; 492 voted for non-denominational schools, 160 against. The ringing of bells and the firing of firecrackers announce the joy of victory; the city is festively flagged; from the tower of the Protestant Providence Church resounds the so-called little Catholic Te Deum, "Great God, we praise you," and the "chorale," as the telegrams called it: "Heil unserm Fürsten Heil. In the evening there was a torchlight procession. Finally on June 24 at noon followed the third act, the vote of the Jews. All votes were in favor of the mixed schools. Once again bells rang from the Protestant church, firecrackers were fired, the streets were flagged, and from 12-1 p.m. the Jews paraded, arm in arm with the Protestants and Catholics, preceded by music and black-red-gold flags. Between 4 and 5 o'clock the Ausscheller invites by bell all the school children of the city to assemble at 6 o'clock on the parade ground for the procession through the city. - What do we want to say to this? One has begun with the non-denominational church, one proceeds to the non-denominational school and it will end with the - non-denominational people. (Evangelical Lutheran Church Newspaper.)

The Rationalists and the Freemasons. According to the "Evangelisches Kirchenblatt für Baden," such a close connection takes place between the Protestant Association and Freemasonry that the leaders of the former usually accompany high charges in the latter. The President Bluntschli is Grand Master of the Swiss Grand Lodge Alpina; Schenkel, Holzmann and Zittel in Heidelberg; Oberhofprediger Schwarz in Gotha; Baumgarten, Holtzendorf and Sydow in Berlin; the Pastors Bulle and Menchot in Bremen are not only lodge brothers, but mostly Masters of the Chair, lodge orators, etc.

Signs of the Times. In Vienna, a Christian woman has once again converted to Judaism in order to marry an Israelite who made this conversion a condition; she is the daughter of a well-off factory owner, and therefore a consideration of money cannot be assumed as a motive. Next Sunday the wedding will take place in the "Israelite temple" of the first district ("synagogues" are out of fashion). From January 1 to the end of May of this year, 71 persons converted to Judaism, 34 to the Augsburg Confession, 9 to the Helvetic Confession, 11 to the Catholic Church and one to the Greek Oriental Church.

The Viennese "Presse" notes how much Judaism appears to be favoured in this, and explains this phenomenon as all the more remarkable, since "according to the historical testimonies" (not of the Old Testament) "the Jews have always been averse to proselytism". Of Rabbi Dr. Jellinek here, she mentions in particular that he rejects many converts who register with him. Certainly, but what can he do about it, or against it, if the influx becomes so excessive? (Herald of Faith.)

There are 62 ecclesiastical periodicals published in **France,** of which 25 are Protestant and 3 Jewish, the remainder Catholic. One Catholic paper, called ***Journal de St. Joseph,*** is circulated in 56,000 copies, another in 50,000. (Apologet.)

Bavaria. The strict Roman press of Germany is taking up arms against the famous Catholic Provost of St. Cajetan in Munich, Döllinger, known as one of the greatest Catholic writers. The other day Döllinger gave a speech on maternal duties at the Munich Herrenhaus: he was very much resented for it. Now, however, he is even accused of having made a dogmatic break with the Catholic Church. In the "Allgemeine Zeitung" five articles about the forthcoming Council appeared which were attributed to him and which were confiscated in Rome. An investigation against Döllinger is said to be already under way. The ultramontanes have already chicaned Döllinger a great deal, he has always yielded up to now; hopefully he will soon learn to see that the principles of Romanism are in irresistible contradiction with many of the "main doctrines" of Scripture and the liberal aspirations of the peoples.

The 2000 Christian missionaries who are at present preaching to the heathen are distributed among the various countries approximately as follows:

In India and Ceylon there are about	600
In China and Japan	150
In the rest of Asia	150
In South Africa	300
In West Africa	200
In the Antilles and South America	300
In North America	100
In Polynesia	200

(Church friend.)

Spiritualism in Germany. In Leipzig a small congregation of Spiritualists, headed by a Polish Count Boninsky, has come together in a more solid association (as it seems, without abandoning the previous church affiliation). It consists mostly of religiously animated people of the bourgeoisie, among whom this new sectarianism is especially canvassing. Spiritualism spreads from Paris and London silently further and further in Germany. (Allg. Kz.)

As Dr. Hengstenberg's successor in the theological (Old Testament exegesis) professorship in Berlin, a certain Prof. Dillmann from Giessen, a very capable Orientalist and student of Ewald's, i.e. belonging to the so-called newer critical school, is named. Of course, progress will be the goal.

Dr. Cumming, the world-famous chiliast, has asked the Pope for permission to come to the ecumenical council. He wants to explain to the assembled bishops why the Protestants have separated from the Catholics.

(Church friend.)

The army of the Antichrist. According to the latest reports, it numbers about 140 million heads. These are led by 300,000 monks and nuns, 325,600 worldly clergy, 624 bishops, 146 archbishops, 12 patriarchs and 80 cardinals who wear the red hat. All these follow one, not Christ, but the Antichrist, the Pope, - if need be, also into hell.

Young Men's Associations. In Europe there are 757 Christian Young Men's Associations, with a membership of 25,000. In America there are over 500 of these societies, with a membership of about 70,000. A mission has been founded, whose task it is to found an association at each main station of the Pacific Railroad.

(Apologet.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 15. December 1869. No. 12.

The Status Controversiae.

False teachers have no faith in their error that is founded in God's Word and lies in their conscience. The consequence of this is that as long as they think they can defend their error against all attacks, they defend it with great courage and fight the opposing truth with all audacity; but when they have overcome themselves and see the ground wavering and fading under their feet, they file off the points of their assertions and impute to the defenders of the truth against which they have fought assertions of which the latter have never thought. This is what the Zwinglians, among others, did. With great courage they at first asserted that in the words, "This is my body," the little word "is" meant something like "means," and that therefore only bread and wine, not Christ's body and blood, could be present in Holy Communion and be partaken of with the mouth. But when Luther had hereupon victoriously proved that, where in an improper speech it appeared as if "is" meant as much as "signifies," the improper mode of speech did not occur in the copula "is," but rather always in the predicate, that "is" could never be put and taken for "signifies," because otherwise all certainty of human speech would be annulled; when therefore Luther wrote with full cheerful certainty: "If the enthusiasts in all the languages that are on earth bring a saying in which 'is' is as much valid as 'means,' they shall have won" (XX, 1131.): then the Zwinglians saw themselves beaten, and their ground tottering and fading under their feet. But what did they do? Did they confess their error, and now give glory to the truth? Nothing less than this. They now appeared all the more bold, and only consciences that stood on God's word noticed them in spite of their

Luther writes of them: "They also act with a stupid, despondent conscience, so that it seems to me that they would like to have the beer back in the barrel; and if they had not started it, I think they should leave it there. . . I will let them boast and flaunt and confidently swear by God's judgment and wrath, as they are sure of things: but these are words that they may gladly cover and adorn their uncertain consciences, that no one may know how their hearts inwardly shake and weave, as a reed moved by the wind, from great uncertainty of their conceit and madness." (XX, 957. 969.) What, then, did Zwingli himself do? He wrote, as Luther tells us, "that his opinion is not to stand on whether 'is' is taken (anywhere) for 'interpreted,' that therefore also here in the Lord's Supper must be so taken; but that, because other words of Scripture and faith compel that the words of the Lord's Supper may not have our old understanding, so the 'is' is taken for 'interpreted' in them." (XX, 1130. f.) But while Zwingli thus sought to file away the top of his own error, which he saw refuted, he at the same time placed himself as if he had fought only against a natural presence of the body and blood of Christ, against Capernaism, which Luther taught, and against its formula "in, with, and under." Hence Luther writes: "We poor sinners are not so foolish as to believe that Christ's body is in the bread in the grossly visible way, as bread in a basket or wine in a cup: We poor sinners are not so mad as to believe that Christ's body is in the bread in the grossly visible way, like bread in a basket or wine in a cup, as the enthusiasts would have us do with our foolishness, but we believe straightway that his body is there, as his words read and point to it: This is my body. But that the fathers and we sometimes say, Christ's body is in the bread, is because our faith confesses that Christ's body is there. Otherwise we may well suffer it to be said, He is in the bread, He is the bread, He is where the bread is, or however one pleases. Over words we will not quarrel; only that the sense may remain, that it is not bad bread which we eat in the supper of Christ, but the body of Christ." (XX, 1011. f.) *)

Similar experiences as Luther once had with the Zwinglians, we so-called Missourians must now have with the Iowans. With great boldness they have put forward, among other things, the modern false theory of the "open questions" as their church principle, and have defended it orally and in writing; but after we have demonstrated the terrible implications of this theory in such a way that everyone, even the weakest, can see that it is erroneous and highly dangerous, and that any defense of it is not justified.

*Bucer was so honest that, after reading Luther's great confession of Holy Communion, he recanted the accusation that Luther had ever taught impanation and consubstantiation, which he had been led to believe by Zwingli and Oekolampad. See Bucer's Retractation, in "Lehre und Wehre" mitgetheilt Jahrg. II, p. 35. f.

of the same would only expose the advocates of that theory more - now the gentlemen have taken the file in hand to file off the wickedest points of their error unnoticed, on the other hand they foist upon us a doctrine which we have nowhere pronounced, and against it, as against our error, they courageously take up arms.

In an essay published in the Brobstische "Lutherische Zeitschrift" of Nov. 6, Professor Gottfried Fritschel formulates the controversy as follows:*)

"Now, because the Iowa colloquians agreed with the Missourians in the matter of the doctrine of Sunday, but found no reason for church separation in the doctrine of those who regard the celebration of one day in the week as belonging to the moral part of the third commandment, but were willing to bear this difference, where it could not be removed, in peace and love, hence in more recent times those intemperate attacks of the Missourians against the Iowans on account of the so-called 'open questions.' Hence it is said in the -Lutheran' that no Christian man should hear Prof. S. Fritschel preach on the third commandment. Therefore it is said that the Iowans have abandoned a doctrine clearly presented in God's Word (namely, that Sunday is merely an ecclesiastical ordinance) for the sake of some old teachers. Therefore they are accused of denying the clarity of the Scriptures, and other such nonsensical and slanderous accusations. The matter is simply that, of the two doctrinal views presented above, they hold one to be correct, the other, however, to be error, but not a heresy that annuls church fellowship. . . From what has been said the reader can already see to some extent what it means when one speaks of open (i.e. not church-dividing) questions. For it is this punct of Sunday which has been entirely at issue in the controversy of open questions in modern times."

The reader sees that the point of controversy in regard to the "open questions" is, according to Prof. Fritschel, that the Iowans regard and declare the erroneous presentation of the doctrine of Sunday, as found among old, otherwise orthodox teachers, to be an error, but not a church-dividing one, while the Missourians regard it as a church-dividing heresy.

If this were really the case, it would be miserable enough for us poor Missourians, and we could undoubtedly do nothing better than to separate from ourselves and go over to the genuinely evangelical, innocent Iowa. But things, praise God, are different.

*) Mr. Brobst declares himself willing to include a statement from the Missouri side on the point in question, but we have no desire to make the colorful ehrumonistic sheet even more colorful and thus help to promote this kind of union.

First of all, as far as we Missourians are concerned, we have by no means declared the mere difference in the doctrine of Sunday, such as that between Luther and Gerhard, to be a church-dividing or the doctrine of the latter to be a heresy. On the contrary, in the course of our Colloquy with the Iowans, the following were our relevant declarations: "First of all, I do not acknowledge that the doctrine of Sunday is not clearly revealed in the Word of God, although I am prepared to treat such men who depart from it with all leniency". (Stenographical Colloquium, etc. p. 105.) "For the doctrine of Sunday I will have my head beaten down. However, if I saw that someone was mistaken in it, I would not immediately heresy him for it." (*Ibidem* p. 110.) "All that God has clearly revealed is not an open question. It is quite another question how I am to behave toward a man who errs, lest he sink deeper and deeper into it, and Satan devour him; so that even one who errs in the high article of the Trinity I would not at once regard as a heretic, how much less one who errs in a subordinate point! Only he, then, who teaches that he has not the *fundamentum personale* (Christ himself), or the fundamentum *dogmaticum (*the sum of all fundamental articles), or the fundamentum *organicum* (the instrumental foundation), is a heretic.
or the holy Scriptures themselves) and, in spite of repeated admonition, stubbornly declares that he wants to stick to his doctrine, I declare him to be a heretic, but not him who does not attack the foundation, or who may well be mistaken in other points, but wants to be taught. I know we can get no further in this life than a fundamental unity." (p. 76.) "Our congregations want to know: what is preached is divine truth; we can rely on that. Woe to the preacher who brings anything else to the pulpit! Woe to the watchman who does not punish it! But otherwise one should be very careful and only refuse fellowship to someone if it turns out that the fault lies in his evil disposition." (p. 82.) "There is a great difference whether I say: one is not a Lutheran, or: he is an erring Lutheran. A Lutheran is one who confesses without falsehood the whole Word of God and those doctrines by which the Lutheran Church differs from other churches. If he errs in less fundamental points, this does not take away his character as a Lutheran. I am fully inclined to regard errorists in the doctrine of Sunday as Lutherans, but as erring." (P. 91.) "Finally, if it has been declared by one of the Colloquents of our part, that the pure doctrine of Sunday, like all the less Principle Articles, belongs to the fundamental ones, and touches the ground of faith, and that, therefore, the contesting of it offends against the ground of faith, though only indirectly, the Colloquent had not both

We do not have in mind a presentation of the doctrine of Sunday, such as Gerhard gives, as one that is in direct contradiction with the high article of Christian liberty. Finally, however, we must declare: as far as we are from wanting to condemn a Gerhard for the sake of his not entirely symbolic presentation of the doctrine of Sunday and to deny him Lutheran orthodoxy, and as little as it occurs to us to regard such a deviation as a reason for the abolition of ecclesiastical fellowship: so, too, we cannot, on the high reputation of such a great church teacher as a Gerhard, treat the doctrine of our symbols of Sunday, clearly revealed in God's Word, as an open question and tolerate a deviation from it. g. open question, and tolerate any deviation from it." (S. 99.)

With these explanations, which we, as appointed representatives of the Missouri Synod, have given to the Iowans, the reader may now compare what contrast Prof. Gottfried Fritschel ascribes to us Missourians in the citation given. Is it not a disgrace and shame that a Lutheran professor can claim the most obvious untruth to be truth?

The reader will now perhaps ask in astonishment: Was it not, then, as the Professor has not deigned to pretend, that the controversy was that the Missourians had declared that erroneous doctrine of Sunday to be heretical and church-dividing, while the Iowa Synod had declared it not to be church-dividing; what, then, was and is the difference?

Let us now let Mr. Iowans speak for themselves. On the part of the Iowaer, among other things, the following was declared: "I, too, stand in such a way that I could die for the doctrine of Sunday, and therefore it is a doctrine of faith to me." (P. 110.) "I maintain it" (the "symbolic doctrine" of Sunday) "is binding because it is in the Word of God, but not because it is in the symbols." (P. 111.) "We have thus understood that by doctrines of faith are to be understood only those which are clearly and unmistakably contained in God's word, such as those of baptism and of holy communion. But there are, besides these, such doctrines as are not so clearly and unmistakably contained in God's word; as the doctrine of Sunday." (P. 113.) "I could not think him" (Jacob Andreä) "a Lutheran, if he had so departed in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But now I must not for the sake of deviation in the doctrine of Sunday. The reason for this is that it is not so clearly stated in God's Word." *) (P. 106.) "Nothing can be considered or asserted as an open question, which is clearly written in God's word." (P. 70.) "I take the expressions 'open questions' and 'issues' to be quite identical." (P. 80.) "The dissenter must have a right to hold and express a different conviction." (p. 83.) After

*) So it is not because it is a subordinate point, but because it is not so clearly written in God's Word!

After it had been mentioned on the part of Missouri that the Iowa Colloquents had made the concession that all the doctrines of faith contained in the symbols were binding, but had subsequently excluded the doctrine of Sunday as the "only one of the doctrines drawn from God's Word" from the binding ones, the Iowa Colloquents issued the following statement for the record: "Concerning the statement . . . that we had orally admitted that all the doctrines of faith contained in the symbols were symbolically obligatory, we declare that we not only orally admitted this proposition, but also put it on record, having mutually agreed *) that the obligatory contents should not include problematic doctrines, but only those doctrines of faith which are clearly and distinctly contained in God's Word." (P. 103.) "They asked me, What do you think the doctrine of Sunday is? To which I replied, For a doctrine of faith; but by this I cannot mean to say that it cannot be a doctrine of faith to others. . . It is quite another question: What is the doctrine of faith? and: What do I consider to be the doctrine of faith? ... I believe that there are many in the Lutheran Church who say that the doctrine of Sunday is not one of the doctrines of faith to be accepted." (p. 110. 112.) What we Missourians replied to this was, among other things, chiefly as follows: "I do not think it right for you to put the difference between us in that we wish those who err in symbolical doctrines to be treated differently. This is not the controversy, for in the treatment of those who err we are probably agreed. No. The question is, whether all the doctrines which the sacred Scriptures present, and which are contained in the symbolical books, are also symbolically binding." (P. 107.) "All doctrines of faith must be clearly revealed in God's Word, or we would be evil in them. Among these is the doctrine of the Christian's freedom from the Jewish Sabbath; but it goes without saying that a man may be hindered from seeing this. If, then, you admit me, the doctrine of Sunday is a doctrine of faith, you have also admitted it is clearly revealed in the word of God. He who does not see this must be blind, or have a curtain before his eyes." (P. 113.) "I have always thought him the best Lutheran who stands most firmly on the clear word of God. What he finds there,

*) By declaring themselves unanimous with us in the proposition that "all doctrines of faith contained in the symbols are symbolically binding," the Iowans had thus availed themselves of a double *reservatio mentalis,* first, by secretly reserving the right not to include the doctrine of Sunday, which they had declared to be a doctrine of faith, because they believed it to be so, but many others did not, and, secondly, by including this doctrine among the problems as one not clearly and unmistakably taught in God's Word. Thus, after a short period of rejoicing over a supposedly important consensus, we found ourselves betrayed.

is certain to him, and he must find it obligatory for all men. Therefore I cannot understand how any one can say: to me this is a doctrine of faith, whether to others I do not know. That would be contrary to the article of faith concerning the perspicuity of Scripture." (p. 114.) "Consider, however, if you want to say that the thing must not be clearly revealed because many do not see it clearly, how would you speak of the doctrine of *communicatione idiomatum* (of the communication of attributes)? So, for God's sake, do not go on accusing the Holy Scriptures of obscurity because great men have not understood them! The Lutheran Church confesses with great unanimity that God has revealed the pure doctrine brightly and clearly, and only if we hold this fast can the ground of salvation also remain fixed to us." (p. 115.) "He who says to me, that the doctrine of Sunday is just not clearly revealed in God's word, and therefore not binding, may also say, that it is not clear that Christ is omnipresent according to his human nature." (P. 117.) "It is true, here we find a difference between us. Only I beg you, if you wish to establish the difference, not to represent it as if we were the rigorous people who could have no patience with erring, you, on the contrary, the mild; but this is the difference: we want one to be committed to all the doctrines of faith in the symbols, but you want the committed one to be able to exclude this and that still. For instance, you say now that you want the doctrine of Sunday exempted, and you do not know any further now, but tomorrow you may think of another, and to another ten, and to another twenty. So it is not a question of a single doctrine, but of a principle." (p. 109.) "It is true, there may also be doctrines which are decidedly revealed in the sacred Scriptures, and through the envy of the fool, delusion has taken possession of the hearts; now it would not be in place for him who has known the truth to exercise a certain dominion over those who do not yet know it. He can hold no one to be an unchristian who is not convicted; but these are not open questions, but would have to be testified against again and again as against error." (S. 71.)

The foregoing, then, suffices as documentary evidence of the *status controversiae that* existed and still exists between us and Iowa in regard to the doctrine of Sunday. We would consider it an insult to the attentive reader if we were now to take from the above a long demonstration that Prof. G. Fritschel's account is a shameful, irresponsible distortion. Everyone can see, even by comparison without proof, that the gentlemen of Iowa declare the pure doctrine of Sunday once with a full mouth for a doctrine of faith on which they are ready to "die" because it is clearly and distinctly contained "according to their conviction" in the Holy Scriptures (p. 90).

but then to "freely give" the same with the same mouth as an open question, as a problematic doctrine (p. 110), and to teach the dissenter differently than to grant justice (p. 83), because that doctrine is "not clearly and unmistakably" (p. 113) taught to others in the holy Scriptures, and because it is therefore not accepted by great theologians for a doctrine of faith. - We are hardly mistaken in supposing, therefore, that the gentlemen of Iowa, as once the gentlemen of Zwingli, now also wish "the beer were again in the cask." But what is said is said; nothing helps here but recantation. -

When Professor F., in the essay referred to, recklessly, nay, sacrilegiously, declares our i. e. Luther's doctrine of usury, drawn from God's clear words, for such a doctrine, "which is quite obviously contrary to God's clear and express word" and rests on a Levitical-legal standpoint, we simply refer to the theses on which our last synodal negotiations were based, in which this very point is irrefutably proved, that Luther's doctrine not only rests on clear sayings of Scripture, but also necessarily results from the simple basic principles of love and justice. - Perhaps we will return to this subject later; until then, let the gentlemen of Iowa win over the whole world that has sunk into usury and call it under their banners; those who are of the truth will at last also fall to this truth and blow away the dust that Iowa stirs up in order to shroud the bright rays of it in darkness. -

If, finally, Professor F. also blathers about our declaring the doctrine of the sleep of the soul to be a problem, then he may do so; an attentive reader will soon notice that in the relevant, though somewhat unclear passage of the report of our eastern district, it is not both our opinion and that of the old Dannhauer. That we do not share the same opinion is easy to see from the fact that, first, for this very reason, in "Lehre und Wehre," XIV, 35, where we give the relevant quotation from Dannhauer, we have omitted the passage about soul-sleep, and that, secondly, we have defended Luther against Professor G. Fritschel's reproach that the former had made the doctrine of soul-sleep an open question. W.

The four kingdoms of Daniel.
(Continued.)

4. the Roman Empire.

We now come to the fourth of the symbolized kingdoms, the Roman according to the ecclesiastical interpretation, which is thus described: "His", the image, "thighs were of iron, his feet were part iron and part clay". (Dan. 2, 33.) "According to

I saw this one. . . and, behold, the fourth beast was hideous and terrible, and very strong, having great iron teeth, and devouring and crushing, and treading down the rest with his feet; it was also much different from the former, and had ten horns. And when I had shorn the horns, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom the foremost three were plucked up: and, behold, that horn had eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." (Dan. 7, 7. 8.)

Iron is the metal by which this realm is characterized in both dream visions. It is a fourth kingdom, different from the first three, like iron from gold, silver and ore. At the same time the iron points to the power and strength of this kingdom, as can be seen in Jer. 15, 12. and Micah 4, 13. This is also the interpretation of Dan. 2:40: "The fourth shall be as hard as iron. For as iron crusheth and breaketh in pieces, so shall it crush and break in pieces all things," namely, other kingdoms. How this fits the Roman Empire, we will see below when we look at the text from chapter 7, which is even more specific.

Whether the legs have a special meaning, may be doubtful. Calov thinks that they indicate a division of the tribal kingdom into two, but, as v. 41 teaches, this is indicated by the two materials, iron and clay. Vulture thinks that the thighs, with much soft flesh on them, indicate leniency toward the conquered; but these thighs are of iron, and in general the Romans were not lenient either. It would be more correct to point out that just as the thighs follow the body, so this fourth kingdom should not be at the same time as, but after, the other three.

It says further: "The feet were partly iron and partly clay". The difference and mixture of the materials indicated here has a threefold meaning according to Daniel's interpretation. First, he says in v. 41: "But that thou sawest the feet and toes, part of clay, and part of iron: it shall be a divided kingdom, but the plant of iron shall remain in it, as thou sawest iron mixed with clay. The division of the tribal kingdom into several kingdoms, as prophesied here, is interpreted by our ancient, as well as by those of the more recent, who hold the ecclesiastical interpretation, from the division of the Roman empire into the Oriental and the Western. After the Roman empire had always been undivided until the reign of Diocletian, this emperor considered it necessary to accept a co-ruler who ruled the west of the empire. Under Constantine the Great, the unity of the empire was restored. The division of the empire among Constantine's sons into three parts lasted only until A.D. 354, in which year Constantius became sole ruler.

Valentinian I left the East to his brother Valens, but Theodosius the Great again ruled the whole empire from 394 AD. After such a division of the empire had long been in preparation, it finally came to pass when the last-named emperor died in 395 A.D. and left to his 18-year-old son Arcadius the prefecture of the Orient with the eastern part of the Illyrian prefecture, and to his 11-year-old son Honorius the remaining parts of the empire in the West. This division of the empire is probably seen first in our text. It is not impossible, however, that further divisions into more than two kingdoms are meant, as here also the (ten) toes are thought of and chapter 7. ten horns are mentioned. Here, then, the empires would have to be counted that arose in the course of time on formerly Roman territory: the Suevian empire 409-585 A.D., the Burgundian 407-534, the German in Italy 476-493, the Eastern Gothic 489-552, the Empire of Britain, as well as the later England, the Frankish Empire with its later parts France, Germany and Burgundy, the Western Gothic Empire 419-711, the Avar Empire 555-640, the Longobard Empire 569-774, the Slavic Empire in Dalmatia around 620, the Serbian Empire 636-1459 and others.

Of this divided empire it is said: "But of the iron plant shall remain within," which evidently means nothing else than that even the empires arising from the original will not be absolutely weak and contemptible, but will also possess power and strength, which Calov, for example, understood in his time of the German emperors, and at any rate can now still be said of the empires of France, England, Germany, Austria, and indeed of many of the above-named, which have arisen from the Roman.

The connection of iron and clay is interpreted by Daniel v. 42: "And the toes of his feet being part iron and part clay, it shall be partly a strong kingdom, and partly a weak kingdom. As iron is a picture of strength and power, so clay is a picture of weakness and frailty, 2 Cor. 4:7, 5:1. cf. Ps. 2:9. So then both are here interpreted by Daniel. The divided kingdom should be partly strong and partly weak. It was indeed weak in the Western Roman Empire, and stronger in the Eastern Roman Empire. Strong were the empires of the Franks and the Vandals; weak, on the other hand, the German empire in Italy, the Suevic and the Burgundian. Now such strong empires are Germany, Austria, France, England, but weak ones are Greece, Belgium. - Perhaps this mixture of iron and clay also points to the alternating strength and weakness of the individual empires.

Finally Daniel interprets this mixture v. 43. for the third time thus: "And that thou sawest iron mixed with clay, they shall be well mixed

The first is that the two families are not the same, and the second is that they are not the same, and the third is that they are the same. This mingling according to human blood is interpreted by older and newer ones, perhaps without exception, of intermarriages among the ruling families of the kingdoms. By such marriages the kingdoms seek to unite with each other, but in vain. - The number of examples that could be cited here, some of which may follow, is almost innumerable.

The Western Roman Emperor Valentinian III married Eudoxia, the daughter of the Eastern Roman Emperor Theodosius II, but when he was threatened by the Huns, the Byzantine court did not send the promised help. - Around 945, Louis of France married Gerberga, the sister of the German Emperor Otto I, in order to have a confederate in him, but Otto II was already at war with the French King Lothar over Lorraine. - The eldest son of Henry II of England was the son-in-law of Louis VII of France. When the latter had to flee to his father-in-law, the latter invaded Normandy, from which Henry had to expel him by force of arms around 1174. - In order to establish the further greatness of his house, Frederick Barbarossa married his son Henry to Conftanzia, the future heiress of the Norman kingdom. He had no idea, however, that this increase in his power was the cliff on which the fortunes of his house were to fall. - Richard II. of England married in 1396 Jsabella, the daughter of Charles VI. for the fortification of peace, only 28 years later the Anglo-French war broke out. War broke out again. - At the conclusion of the Peace of Chateau-Cambresis in 1559, Henry II of France had to give his daughter Elizabeth in marriage to King Philip II of Spain. But Henry IV, who came to the throne in 1594, was already at war with Spain again. - Napoleon married Marie Louise, daughter of the Austro-Hungarian Emperor Francis II, but in spite of this, Austria finally fought against the son-in-law of its Emperor. - In these examples the fulfillment of our prophecy of the fourth empire is revealed.

Let us now proceed to the prophecy contained in the seventh chapter, which we find in vv. 7 and 8, repeated in vv. 19-21, and interpreted in vv. 23-26. There it says: "The fourth beast would be terrible and horrible and very strong," according to v. 23, "mightier than all the kingdoms" that have been symbolized so far. This can obviously be said of the Roman empire, the most powerful of all empires.

Wherein consisted the ghastly and terrible, and the power of this nameless monstrosity, is hereafter indicated. "It had great iron teeth". Teeth are an image of wrath, of cruelty, of power to harm and to destroy. Cf. Deut. 5, 32, 24. Ps. 57, 5. 58, 7. Klagel. 2, 16. Joel 1, 6. This power to exercise cruel wrath and to harm appears very great; for the teeth are iron

do not break (Lamentations 3:16), do not rot (Prov. 25:19), do not easily become dull (Ezek 18:2). With these iron teeth the beast "devoured", which is interpreted in v. 23: "It shall devour all the earth. Of the second beast it was said, "Arise, and eat much flesh," here of the fourth, "It shall eat all the earth." This is not the same. This kingdom does not merely shed much human blood, but it eats, consumes, devours other kingdoms. It is called "around itself," it is insatiable, and from the nearest kingdoms, it is catching hold, it is going to the more distant ones. Here, then, is described a kingdom that continually devours other kingdoms. - It is also said of this beast: it "crushes," which is interpreted in v. 23: "It will thresh all the countries" (according to the Hebrews), which expression, according to Judges 8, 7. 8, 7. Amos 1, 3. Hab. 3, 12. indicates a cruel treatment. - Finally it says: "And the rest it trampled with its feet," on which, according to v. 19, were "brazen claws." Hereby a very contemptuous treatment and also complete destruction is indicated. Cf. 2 Kings 9:33, Prov. 27:7, Isa. 18:2, 26:6, Amos 5:11, Luc. 21:24, Ebr. 10:29.

All this fits the Roman Empire quite well. To whom would the annexation desires of the same be unknown? About 270 B.C. the subjugation of Italy was completed from the southern points at Rhegium and Leuca as far north as the border rivers of Macra and Rubicon. From now on Rome "entered the circle of the great political relations which, linked to the name of the Punic and Hellenism, extended from the Pillars of Hercules to the Ganges"-relations which at this very time were connected with the alliance of friendship which the second Ptolemaic had offered to the Romans by a legation and which they had solemnly accepted by a counterlegation, - further with the friendly position to the city of Appollonia in Ancient Greece, to which Brundisium, already occupied by the Romans, formed the place of passage, - finally with a cry for help, which sounded from Sicily and called Rome into the fray against Carthage, - took their beginning. - The first Punic war, ended in 242 B.C., brought the Romans possession of Sicily, their first province, the basis of their world domination. Soon Carthage had to surrender Sardinia and Corsica to the Romans just to keep the peace. In 229 B.C. the Illyrians were made subject to tribute, and soon afterwards the Po lands were annexed to the Roman Empire as the province of *Gallia cisalpina.* Significant was the gain with which Rome emerged from the second Punic war. Lower Italy was subjugated in a still more complete sense; Sicily, Sardinia, and Corstca's possessions were secured; Spain was acquired in its entirety; Carthage was completely weakened and made dependent together with Numidia; finally, the dominion of the western Mediterranean and thus the means were won to bring the world of the East into the sphere of its power.

willing to pull. This was the direction in which Rome's rulers looked from now on, in order to gradually tie to his triumphal chariot whatever larger world powers were still present apart from the Carthaginian. In the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C., Antiochus the Great, ruler of the Seleucid Empire, was defeated, losing his European possessions as well as those of Asia Minor on this side of the Taurus, which Rome gave partly to the Pergamenian king and partly to the Rhodians. The Atolerians were forced to acknowledge Rome's supremacy, and in the following year the Galatians together with the kings of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia were conquered. The battle of Pydna in 168 B.C. cost the "Macedonian" empire its existence. Soon afterwards Rome took from the Rhodians all their possessions on the mainland, and as early as 164 B.C. Egypt came under Rome's control. In the third Punic war the Carthaginian territory was transformed into a Roman province under the name of "Africa". The same thing happened to Macedonia in 148 B.C., to the Peloponnesus and Hellas in 146 B.C., to the Pergamenian Empire in 129 B.C., and to Gaul soon after. In 75 B.C. Bithynia was made a Roman province, and Syria several years before. In 79 B.C. Judea, the Bosporan Empire and Great Armenia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Paphlagonia in its smaller part, and Colchis were made Roman fiefdoms, Pamphylia was made a province of Cilicia, Phoenicia a province of Syria. Octavian finally also made Egypt a Roman province. During his 40-year reign the empire, which stretched from the Atlantic to the Euphrates and from the northern coast of Gaul and the Germanic Danube to the Atlas and the Nile, comprised 25 provinces. In A.D. 5 northwestern Germany was made dependent from the Rhine to the Weser, and about A.D. 80 Great Britain and southern Scotland were subdued. About 106 AD.' Chr. Daria, soon afterwards Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria were made Roman provinces, while in the meantime the regions between the Danube and the Upper Rhine were also made part of the empire. Under Diocletian the empire in Germany was extended to the sources of the Danube; about 297 Jberia was annexed to the empire as a Roman province along with several other territories. Thus the conquests and annexations continued. Already under Trajan the empire had 46 provinces against 25 under Octavian. Did not the Roman Empire really eat away at itself? With iron teeth it ate. No danger, however great, broke the courage and the desire to conquer, no defeat, however great, broke the strength of that empire. Its teeth did not break, did not dull, though its weapons almost never rested. Seldom was the temple of Janus closed; once under Numa, then after the first Punic war, after that under Octavian. Never did Rome show her iron teeth more than

in misfortune, e.g. after the terrible defeat at Canna and after the victory of Perseus of Macedonia, from whom, although defeated, it only wanted to accept unconditional submission as a condition of peace. - A similar lust for conquest and a strength that can hardly be broken can also be found in the empires that grew out of the Roman Empire, especially in France under Louis XIV and Napoleon.

As for the prophesied crushing and trampling, this is also confirmed by the history of the Roman Empire. Here belong the countless men whom the Romans killed in war, as, among others, the war of the confederates in Italy about 88 B.C. cost the confederates 300,000 men, while the Romans, of course, lost about as many. From the Memoirs of Caesar it appears that during nine years in Gaul he destroyed a million soldiers and made two million prisoners. What terrible sacrifices cost the Jews their revolt against the Romans in the first century after Christ. And when they later rose up under Bar-Cochba, about a million Jews lost their lives. - At times whole nations were annihilated, as the Boyans in 193 B.C., the Teutons at the battle of Aqua Sextiä in 102 B.C., the Cimbrians on the Roman plain in 101 B.C. - Often also the defeated and captured enemies were slain. The consul Valerius had the Punic garrison of Akragas cut down in 214 BC. By express order of the Senate, Consul Mummius had a large part of the inhabitants of Corinth killed in 146 BC. Sylla, in the capture of Athens in 86 B.C., had his soldiers plundered and murdered at will. Titus had the actual prisoners crucified before Jerusalem. - Frequently the Romans destroyed the walls of conquered cities. Thus the walls of Tarent were pulled down about 272 B.C., 70 Epirotic cities in one day about 168 B.C., all the cities of the Celtiberians in one day about 195 B.C., Athens by Sylla. - Cities were also often destroyed from the ground up, as Carthage in 146v. Chr., Numantia 133 B.C., Germanicus burned the capital of the Cattians, Mattium, in A.D. 15. Jerusalem was razed to the ground by Titus and even more completely devastated in 134 AD, at the same time destroying 58 other cities and 1000 towns. - The inhabitants of the cities and the prisoners were often made slaves. This happened to the citizens of Capua in 211 B.C., to 30,000 citizens of Tarentum in 209 B.C., to 150,000 Epirotes in 168 B.C., to the women and children of Corinth in 146 B.C., to the inhabitants of Numantia in 133 B.C., to the inhabitants of Jerusalem at the first as well as at the second destruction (at the latter their ears were partly cut off). - Not infrequently the vanquished were deprived of all means of ever again waging a vigorous war. After the battle of Zama the

The Carthaginians had to hand over all their warships except ten triple rowers, as well as all trained elephants, and were not allowed to train any new ones. While they themselves were not allowed to wage war without the permission of the Romans, they had to assist them in all wars. When Philip of Macedon was defeated at Kynoscephalae in 197 B.C., he obtained peace on condition that he give liberty to all the Greek cities, make no war outside the Macedonian borders, deliver up all his covering ships, limit his army to 500 heavily armed men. When the Seleucid Antiochus had lost the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C., he was no longer allowed to keep warships and war elephants. In the Third Panic War the Carthaginians had to surrender all arms (200,000 complete suits of armor, 2000 guns, and a number of projectiles). Mithridates, defeated in 85 B.C., had to surrender his whole fleet to the Romans.

The extortions of money and monetary value were terrible. At first, triumphant generals sought their ambition in delivering the largest possible sums of coined gold and silver into the treasury; later they served their own advantage. At the conclusion of the first panic war the Carthaginians not only had to hand over all prisoners to the Romans without ransom, but also had to pay 1000 Euboean talents of silver immediately, 2200 talents within ten years in annual instalments. Soon afterwards Carthage, in order only to keep peace, had to put up with a new war tax of 1200 talents. When Capua fell into the hands of the Romans in 211 B.C., it had to fleece all silver and gold. About 209 B.C. 3000 talents of gold and silver (4,500,000 Prussian thalers) were captured at Taranto. At the end of the Second Punic War Carthage had to undertake to pay tribute of 200 Euboean talents (300,000 Prussian thalers) annually for 50 years, to compensate for the damage done during the broken truce, and finally to supply the Roman army with grain and pay until the arrival of the confirmation of peace from Rome. Philip of Macedonia had to promise to pay 500 talents immediately and another 500 in ten years at the conclusion of peace in 197 BC. When Flamininus celebrated his triumph on his return from Greece, he put 18000 pounds of silver and 3714 pounds of gold into the treasury, not counting the coined gold. Antiochus, the Seleucid, had to pay 15,000 Euboean talents (22,500,000 Prussian thalers) to Rome in 190 B.C., and 427 talents (690,000 Prussian thalers) to its confederate Eumenes. In the third Macedonian war the Romans made such a great booty of money that from then until the end of the republic all Roman citizens in Italy could be exempted from any direct tribute to the state. Mithridates had to pay 3000 talents (5,000,000 Prussian thalers) in 85 B.C., and the seceded Asiatic provinces 20,000 talents (34,000,000 Prussian thalers). - But with

Gold not satisfied, the Romans also robbed art and temple protectors. Since Marcellus had brought the works of art from Syracuse to Rome, the demand for Greek works of art had become so great that Roman generals and state officials did not feel guilty about robbing the conquered Greek and other cities of their most beautiful works of art and sacred objects and bringing them to Rome. This Flamininus did, for example, in the second "Macedonian" war against Greece. When Fulvius defeated the Atolians about 190 B.C., 580 bronze and 230 marble statues were taken from their capital at the triumph. Aemilius Paullus, in his triumph at the end of the third Macedonian war, brought "the" paintings, columns, vases, and other artifacts from Greece and Macedonia on 250 chariots. In order to raise the money he needed for his wars, Sylla had the temples in various Greek cities robbed of their treasures, even the temple at Delphi, where he had the heavy, large silver barrel, which was the only remaining gift from King Croesus, chopped up, among other magnificent votive offerings, in order to make it easier to transport it away. In order to chastise the Rhodians for their threatened apostasy, the Romans interfered with their trade, e.g. by establishing a free port on Delos, by prohibiting the import of salt into Macedonia and the export of shipbuilding timber from that country, in such a way that the Rhodian state began to decline. - At last the provinces were sucked dry in the most atrocious manner. The debts of the Greek cities had grown from 20,000 to 120,000 talents in 14 years by the interest bill of the rich Roman tenants. Antony at once imposed on a province the tribute of nine years. - Perhaps the persecutions of the Christians should also be remembered here. - All the above shows how Rome threshed and trampled all the countries. If one wants a single example of this, compare the history of the Punic wars. - By the way, similar things can also be proved with the empires that arose in Roman territory, but it is sufficient to remember France under Napoleon.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

In defense of Christianity.

If we are now to attempt an evaluation of materialism, this can only be done by first subjecting the creed of the materialists, then their conclusions, and finally their axioms to criticism. For the materialists, too, have their creed, and it has its three

Article as well as the Christian. For as we confess in our first article: I believe in God, the Father, almighty Creator of heaven and earth, so Büchner confesses, "I believe in a beginningless and endless matter." And yet this article of faith contradicts Buechner's first axiom. For if anything is experientially certain, it is that all things perceptible to the senses have a beginning and an end. On the other hand, it is admittedly asserted that all visible objects consist of elements. But elements cannot be destroyed. On the contrary, their changing play produces the thousand colorful forms that we call individuals. Man dies, but the matter of his body mixes with the earth and gives birth to plants. The plants are eaten again by cows, and the cows by men. Thus is an eternal cycle. What passes away is the form, what remains is the substance.

But we don't want to fall into the mistake of that old fruit merchant who could not imagine Vienna without its St. Stephen's Tower. Rather, we want to see how far the testimony of the senses reaches. To be sure, our senses testify to the fact that the basic materials of human bodies do not disappear, but enter into other combinations; that the material in general outlasts the form formed from it. Yes, we admit even more: human power is neither capable of creating an element nor of destroying one. These two propositions are certain. But nothing further can be proved. As soon as, in place of that proposition, "the substance outlasts the form," I say: "it outlasts it for all eternity," I leave the domain of sensuous experience and enter the domain of charcoal-burner belief, which Mr. Vogt loves to ridicule in a manner that is as sensible as it is gentlemanly. Likewise, as soon as I am in favor of: Human power can neither create nor destroy elements, then I leave the field of sensuous experience and enter the field of prophecy, which causes Herr Büchner to laugh so convulsively every time he comes to speak of it. For Herr Büchner is far from a hundred years old, and yet he loves to throw around millennia in his Scharteken, as Alexander Dumas does with millions of francs in his Count of Monte Cristo. Of course, they cost as little to the one as to the other. But Mr. Büchner will neither expect us to take the diamonds the size of a moderate pear, which Mr. Dumas donates to us, for cash, nor his millennia.

Moses says: God created the world; Büchner: The world has been from eternity. Both have not been there. Thus the assertions of both are beliefs, only with the difference that the assertion of the one comes from God, while the assertion of the other is a secretion of his own pineal gland, destined, according to the laws of metabolism, to be transformed into other assertions, perhaps inarticulate, animal ones, for instance into barking.

to transform. And as for the second assertion: the substance will not perish, this is a prophecy, or a prophesying secretion of his pineal gland, of equal certainty with the other, that it will not rain Thursday for nine years. So God shall not prophesy, but Mr. Buechner.

The second article of Büchner's credo reads thus: "I believe in atoms, which are always in motion". In atoms, then. After all, Büchner's first article still had some kind of clue, some kind of basis in observation. This one is completely out of the air. In particular, it slaps his own axioms in the face in a particularly strange and powerful way. He has felt this himself; for instead of attempting to invent a semblance of proof for this silly novel, he rumbles, page 25: "A grain of salt contains billions of groups of atoms which no sensuous eye will ever reach. Hence we cannot but say that the substance, and therefore the world, is infinite in the smallest; and it matters not whether our intellect, which has accustomed itself everywhere to find a measure or a goal, in its finite limitation, perhaps takes offence at such an idea." Aecht pfäffisch! the mind rebels, but it is knocked on the head. Herr Büchner & Co. have two measures, which are an abomination to the Lord. When they intend the Bible, they hurry the mind so that it bites into their leaves; when, on the other hand, they bring forward their own fibs, they strike it in the teeth.

So the Bible is said to be false because its miracles cannot be bottled; these miserable, stale beidnian antics, on the other hand, are said to be true, although not the least of them can be bottled, nor can they even be smelled or seen.

And now even (atoms) - which are always in motion. Also this table? - Wonderful story of these wonderful Büchnerian separations. Fictitious atoms in fictitious motion; that is truly as if two fictitious persons in a novel murder each other. The murder is as well invented as the characters. For people who visit the theater, such fictitious murders are certainly exquisitely touching. We are as little moved by them as by Desdemona's pain or Vulcan's lamentation when Jupiter seized him by the leg and whirled him around his head several times. In fact, Büchner's tumbling atoms are no better and no worse conceived than the poor tumbling volcano, except that the latter, according to the old pagan poets, came down on Lemnos, while the poor atoms, according to the new pagan poets, find no little island on which to rest their weary feet.

And why all this puppet comedy? To make the astonished spectators forget that around them is a bitter reality with heaven and hell.

The third article of the materialist creed reads thus, "I believe that chickens will become monkeys."

Once upon a time there was a caliph who was transformed into a stork. It's in Hauff's fairy tale. Once upon a time there was a stork who was turned into a caliph, say the materialists. Which of the two is more likely? For our part, we simply take the empirical standpoint and declare: We believe neither in the transformation of caliphs into storks, nor in the transformation of storks into caliphs. For neither the one nor the other can be perpetrated by Mr. Vogt or other scholars. Rather, if anything is experientially certain, it is this: Storks remain storks and caliphs remain caliphs. It is also of no use when Mr. Vogt objects that his stork was not transformed into a caliph in an instant by the word *mutabor,* but gradually, in the course of 10,000 years. A wretched evasion! Just as wretched as when a ballad-singer, who is shown to be untruthful in his horror-story, tries to save himself by saying that it happened many hundreds of years ago; things contrary to experience do not become more probable by being attributed a duration of several thousand years.

Let us not forget the first materialistic axiom. Is it not an open mockery first to lay down a principle by which everything is to be measured, and then to add a creed which destroys the very root of the same principle? For through the same hole through which this unproved and unprovable silliness finds entrance, a thousand unproved and unprovable sillinesses may find entrance. Is the transformation of a chimpanzee into an unmarried privadocent only one line more believable than the transformation of water into wine of which John tells? But you see they deny the miracles not at all because they contradict experience, but because the devil rides them. The theory of Darwin and all similar theories are mere masks to cover the hatred against God. It does not matter at all to the Lord half a dozen miracles, if they are only contrary to the Bible. In general, Büchner's creed is by no means a consequence of Büchner's axioms, but a simple fiction dictated by hatred against the creed of the twelve apostles.

We now come to the criticism of the conclusions with which the Mr. Materialists dispute our creed. No angels - they say - no miracles! no God! no soul! for only that is which can be smelled, felt, tasted, heard and seen.

Of course, no one has ever seen the soul with his eyes, but he has seen the angels, the miracles, and the living God. The angels were seen and heard by the shepherds of Bethlehem and by many hundreds of others at various times. And the miracles of Elijah were done in the sight of all Israel, and in the sight of his majesty king Ahab. Now these were not the most high

in the mood to have an X made for a U. Still less the Pharisees in the time of Christ. Truly! if our sweetest Saviour had allowed himself such a shameful trick with the corpse of Lazarus, as Prof. Bahrdt imputes to him, the scribes would not have been such asses to stand by with hands folded in reverence. And as for God, he appeared to Abraham in human form, among the terebints of Mamre. Afterwards he even became flesh and blood, and more than twelve witnesses saw his glory full of grace and truth. All these things were perceived by the senses in their time, and were testified to as having been so perceived. They do not fall, therefore, even if sensual experience alone should be regarded as the source of truth.

But wait! Büchner does not mean sensual experience at all, but: my sensual experience is the source of truth for me. Mine alone and no other. Because no angel has yet appeared to me, therefore I deny that they exist at all. Because I have not yet seen a miracle, therefore I declare its impossibility. Because I have not put my fingers in God's side wound, therefore I deny His Incarnation. - Is this meant seriously? Well then! So you must go further, you must also deny the existence of Napoleon and the existence of Luther, or you are an old woman who says yes today and no tomorrow. For this is how the matter stands: either sensual experience in general (including that of our grandmothers) is the source of truth, and then the passage through the Sea of Reeds is certain, together with the other wounds witnessed by contemporaries. Or my sensual experience alone is source, and then there is no history. For we have seen Frederick the "Great" ride as little as smoke Sinai. You see, Herr Büchner's knife is a little too sharp; it cuts him himself.

And even more: even geography will have to be narrowed down to very modest limits if B?s principle comes into force. How many cities have you seen in your life? Cincinnati? New York? perhaps London and Paris, hardly Irkutzk and Archangel. Maybe not even Constantinople and Moscow. So there's no Irkutzk or Arkhangel? Only because I haven't seen them with my eyes. But so we must conclude when B.'s principle comes to dominion. For Moses saw the Sea of Shils dryly, and yet Mr. Buechner does not believe him, because he - said Mr. Buechner - did not see it with his - more-mentioned Mr. Buechner's - eyes.

I should like to know how many books would be written if the authors merely wanted to assert what they had seen with their own eyes. Poor newspaper writers, you of all people would have to fold up your tents! You, too, poor cable-boy, would have to retire for ever! And how much of the experiments to which

Mr. Büchner refers to in his book, he has probably seen himself? Probably very few, otherwise he would not pause every moment and add (Oersted) or (Cohn) or something else in parenthesis.

Finally, we are left with the critique of the materialistic axioms. But there are two of them. The first is: "There is no vital force, but organic and mechanical are one and the same. Since this is a test of a principle, we appeal not to the powers of deduction of our readers, but to their *common sense*. What do you think distinguishes a dead body from a living one? I think the vital force. What distinguishes an artificial mosquito from a living one? But the life force? What distinguishes a two-year-old child from a crying doll? I think it's the life force. And Mr. Büchner thinks this vitality is nothing. Yes, he is literally furious with it. On page 222 f. he wages a real frog-mouse war against her. On page 230 he even has the pleasure of exclaiming with Mr. Virchow: "Life is only a special kind of mechanics. And with a Herr Professor Mattnucci: "The living organism is a machine like the steam-engine." O great Professor Mattnucci! Why are there no more eagle pies on which you could gorge yourself to death, like your great ancestor, the author of the *1'homme machine* in the castle at Sanssouci! But now, let us submit to this wonderful axiom, on one condition only: namely, if Mr. Büchner or one of his scientific friends can mechanically produce a fly or even a tomato flower. For no offense, Mr. Buechner, but we are somewhat fearful and have become so fond of your excellent principle: to believe nothing that we cannot perceive with our senses. Have you perhaps already produced a mosquito or a tomato flower? In that case I would really advise you to send them to the fair in Indianapolis or St. Paul. Of course, there would have to be a certificate from the authorities that you have manufactured them, because we have no shortage of mosquitoes and tomato flowers. Do you perhaps know the story of Herr von Kempelen in Vienna? Herr von Kempelen constructed an artificial chess player, which won not only simple games, but even gambit games against players who were not inexperienced. And yet his automaton could neither laugh nor cry. Do you know why? I really think, my dear sir, that old Vridank's explanation holds good:

> Got geschuof never stalk so swachen, den ieman müge gemachen.
> der angel, tiuvel, noch der man ir kein; einn vloch gemachen kan. *)

*) Vridank's modesty, edition by Wilhelm Grimm. S. 2.

In case you don't understand Middle High German, I'll translate it for you right now:

God made no stalk, however weak, That anyone could imitate.
Neither the angels nor the devil nor you Can make a flea.

Therefore we declare the unification of the mechanical and the organic to be fictitious. Little girls may believe that their crying dolls eat, but we do not. On the contrary, experience teaches us that there is an enormous gulf between mechanisms and organisms. First fill in this gulf when it pleases you, and when you have finished with it, come again.

The supreme principle of all materialists, at last, is this: "Only that which is perceptible to the senses exists." We have already seen what the meaning of this sentence is: Mr. Buechner makes his sensuous experience the standard of truth. He denies the miracles because he has not seen them with his eyes. He denies the creation ans nothing because he has not been its witness. He no longer wants to believe anything, but only to perceive. Thus he must not accept any bill of exchange, nor take any more paper money; for in both cases a kind of charcoal-burner's faith would lie at the bottom. In the latter, for example, that the State - an invisible and therefore nonexistent thing - will give me a silver thaler if I present my paper. Nor must the materialists, from their standpoint, ask us to believe their books. Rather, according to their own principle, we must doubt all their assertions until we have seen them carried out before our eyes. And this is likely to take quite a long time, especially in the ape question. In a word, the first materialistic axiom is false because, if seriously applied, it leads to quite nonsensical consequences.

But even more: who can guarantee me that my senses are not deceiving? According to Kant, for example, we do not recognize the thing in itself. Again, experience teaches that experience is often deceptive. We think we hear a sound, but none is heard. Joan of Arc swore that she saw St. Margaret and St. Catherine with her bodily eyes, and it was pure imagination. One sees the color green, the other blue, who is right? The majority? And who can vouch for the fact that our eyes are properly organized? Perhaps it is the nature of the Icelandic double spar to show everything twice. Thus we would have only one eye, one arm, half a nose, and so on. Indeed, the atoms could easily have tumbled around the corner! I really do not see why they should have operated so strangely skilfully to form a real eye. Perhaps it's all just a comedy, and when we wake up we'll see we've been dreaming. The great Cartesius himself hath said.

testifies that it is impossible to distinguish dream and waking with certainty. Thus we doubt with Kant and Cartesius.

Mr. Buechner denies the soul in the face of the fact that he is not an ape but writes books. We simply deny the body in the face of the fact that Mr. Buechner eats lunch like other mortals. Both assertions are equally easily made and equally easily denied. Büchner says: "It is true that I write atheistic books, but the real reason is: my atoms tumble in such a peculiar way; if they tumble differently, I would write pious ones". We say, "It is true that Buechner eats noon, but that is a deception of the eye. In truth he has no stomach, but his soul only imagines that it has one. His vivid imagination creates the idea of a material pleasure. And this is the lesson of Berkeley.

George Berkeley was born in Ireland in 1684. In 1721 he became court preacher to the Duke of Grafton. He did much for the conversion of the savages of North America, and at last became Anglican Bishop of Cloyne. His main book is called *Theory of Vision*, London 1709, and his main proposition is: "*The belief in the existence of an external material world is false and inconsistent with itself. Those things, which are called sensible material objects, are not external, but exist in the mind, and are merely impressions made on our minds by the immediate act of God*. He puts it this way: It is clear that by means of the sensations of the face one sees neither the distance nor the size and form of objects, but concludes the same only because one has had the experience that a certain sensation of the face is accompanied by certain sensations of the sense of touch. A material outer world does not exist at all. There are only spirits, that is, thinking beings whose nature consists in imagining and willing.

Today Büchner, tomorrow Berkeley. Thus our poor little ship flounders on the ocean of nonsense when it has lost its only anchor, the Word of God.

But we say: If experience teaches anything, it teaches this: There are invisible things, such as fidelity, love, conscience, and visible things, such as cheese and cake. -

The practical consequences of materialism are to some extent really drawn by his disciples. For it is a generally admitted fact, at least in our country, that the materialists live as if they were all body. But from their principles follows even more than they publicly admit; for if there is no soul, if all our spiritual activity is nothing but the motion of atoms, then there is also no conscience, no honor, no love of country, and no faith. If these principles

but once carried out in general and in earnest, a war of all against all ensues.

Much as Mr. Buechner resists this consequence, things are stronger than men. What is the point of a slogan of power like this, "Scientific materialism and the materialism of life are different things by a mile!!!" Will not a party which lays down the scientific principle, the Pope is the source of truth, be infallibly drawn into the obedience of the Pope by the force of that principle? It can no more escape it than the fly can escape the entanglement of the spider once it has entered its web. He who says A must also say B. He who proclaims revolution will have it. Every principle bears fruit.

But what will be the nature of the state whose members no longer know the difference between evil and good? I think not very orderly. For if neither conscience nor love of country, neither honor nor faith, restrains the men with the hard fists, they will soon smash the brains of the gentlemen of *Wall Street*; nay, they will scrape into their pockets all the money that is on earth, whether in safes or not. And why should two men who are hungry leave a piece of fruit standing unchallenged in the street? If they are true disciples of the gentle Lucrez, they will eat as many pears as they can possibly digest. Enviable state of our human society! Is there such a state anywhere? Yes, in the desert, where the jackals tear the rabbits to pieces, and the tigers the jackals. There is neither conscience nor faith, but the struggle for existence; nothing more.

Materialism.

Thus, in a paper published in French-speaking Switzerland (in Geneva), called "*L'Apologiste,*" a certain *F. de Rougemont* writes to the effect that

End of an essay on this faith of the children of this last time:

"What a frightful disease would not religion be in man without a soul, as the materialists dream him! He has an ape for a father and an effin for a mother, and yet he imagines that he is created in the image of an infinite being, which does not exist! He owes all that he is and possesses to matter, which is beneath him, and yet with his heart and eyes he seeks in the infinity of ethereal space its author and its benefactor, who does not exist at all. It would be so easy for him to love no one but himself, who is all flesh, and yet he forms his soul, which likewise does not exist at all, that with all its forces and more than itself

love a God that is not there. Like a poor fool, who thought himself married, and wrote letters two or ten times a day to his wife, whom he thought was in America, but who was nowhere to be found but in his brain; similarly, he continually sends up his prayers to God, who does not exist! Like a fisherman who holds his rod high in the air to catch fish there, he is convinced that by his supplications he will receive the richest blessings of a God who does not exist at all. If he acts against his conscience, which again is an empty word, he adds to the accusations of it, which is only a rotten spot of his brain, the terrors of a great God who does not exist at all. Even he is such a fool as to dream that after his death his soul, which does not exist, will be eternally happy or unhappy, according to its works. He is born of the earth and made for the earth, and he imagines that he is of God, by God, and for God; and yet there is no God. Can you think of anything more foolish than man, and more sad and ridiculous than the fate of such a man?

And, on top of all this, let it be remembered that all men are afflicted with this religious disease! Yes, all, I say, for even the atheists have infinite trouble to cure themselves of it and not to be seized by it again. Yes, one says to oneself that they never quite manage it; that the thought of God haunts them like a terrible spectre, and that they deny it with such clamor merely because they wish to stifle their involuntary doubts.

But we are not judges of what goes on in their hearts; better, however, do we know the men of genius who, from the earliest times to this day, have been the glory of this poor human race, and know that they of all men are so stupid as to worship and serve God. You would think these at least would have discovered and proclaimed the high wisdom and sacred truth of atheism. Alas! I am desolate for the materialists; there is not a single genius of the first rank who did not believe in God, and the most famous atheists of the past centuries (not to speak of those of the present time) have all been stars of very small stature. Thus we hear from David that in his time there were free spirits in Judea; but not a single memory has remained among his descendants, while the "developments of the brain" of the prophet, his psalms, are found after 3000 years translated into two hundred languages and are sung from one end of the earth to the other. In the same way, Moses, whose "brain-products" are recorded in the Pentateuch, and who created the only people among all that cannot blur anything, was a weakling, who very earnestly pretended to have done miracles and to have talked with God himself, who, after all, does not exist.

Look at all the sages of Greece, all the artists, all the orators, all the great statesmen, and even the philosophers. Can you find a single one among them who was a materialist, except Democritus and Epicurus? Let us go to Rome: there you will find, I know it well, a whole herd of Epicurus' swine, but in the whole house there is only one known name, Lucrez, and even he believed that there was a god. (?) There you see the whole share, and what a share! that materialism can claim for itself of all the glory of antiquity. Before the Saturnalia of the flesh under Louis XV, the whole Christian era leaves him only Hobbes, the notorious advocate of tyranny. Lalande publicly renounced his unbelief at Lyon towards the end of his life on his deathbed; Laplaee saw other clarities than those of the stars.

How is it possible that matter, our only mother, could make such an absurd mistake as to produce a race that believes entirely in a god of nothingness? Ordinarily, she is not so clumsy. Observe how well she has calculated the crystallization of minerals, the stem, the roots, and the branches of plants, the complex and delicate organs of animals. Note especially how she has given to each animal the instinct appropriate to its physical structure and measured according to it. The cock has the desires of a domestic bird and not those of an eagle; the hare feels in itself no inclination at all to be a lion, and the gorilla in its primeval forests makes no effort whatever to become a poet, an advocate, or an emperor. Why is it that man alone cannot keep himself within the bounds appropriate to his species? Why does he want to surpass himself and why does he long for the infinite? Since the needs of his body are very easily satisfied, why are those of his soul, and has he no soul, why are not the desires of his brain as easily satisfied as those of his stomach? Why is it said, from the time of Ecclesiastes to our own, "The eye never sees its fill," and why does the mind never grow tired of knowing, nor reason of judging? But above all, why does man labor to know God, since he does not exist, and why is he afraid of him? Why does he not surrender himself to perish, like his dog or cat, and why does he not simply deign to be his own master and God? In a word, how is it that nature, when she wants to produce minerals, plants, and animals, always hits the nail on the head without fail; how is it that she never manages it when it comes to man? For all men, with the exception of freethinkers and atheists, would be misguided creatures, since they, who would be nothing but

I defy the materialists to explain the absolute contradiction between the perfection of all animals and the absurd position of man, who is supposed to be the most perfect of them all. I defy the materialists to explain the absolute contradiction between the perfection of all animals and the absurd position of man, who should be the most perfect creature among them all.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

From the proceedings of the *General Council*. From the report of this in the number of the "Durluu-nu auü Zlissiouur" of November 18. November we find, among other things, the following: "The Committee for Answering Certain Questions of the Minnesota Synod reported: The Synod of Minnesota asks concerning the declaration of the ***General Council*** on the four points, od it be the right understanding of the same that heretics and such as err in fundamental doctrines cannot be admitted to our altars as communicants nor from our pulpits as teachers of our congregations, and whether the principles enunciated at Pittsburg are to be applied to those who, in the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church, do not agree with the pure doctrine of the Word of God as taught and held by our church? Both questions are to be answered in the affirmative, as the exceptional cases on the latter point, if they arise, are necessarily left to the decision of the faithful pastor. - This report was joined by Rev. Pros. S. C. Harkey, of Illinois, earnestly opposed it, and declared that if any Christian came to his church he would grant him full communion. He then proposed the following substitute: "In regard to the questions of the Minnesota Synod, be it resolved, that these two questions may without propriety be answered in the affirmative, and ought justly to have been understood thus and not otherwise. But by the persons so stated are to be understood only those whose heresy and fundamental error make them enemies of the cross of Christ, and children of wickedness, to be judged not by this Council, but by the pastors and congregations in the several cases as the same may happen. Further, that this Council, having unequivocally set itself apart from the word of God and the confessions of the church, must once for all decline to make any law outside of them, and that by some indeed endless things may be considered as deductions, applications, or conclusions, thereby destroying the liberty of the church and of the preaching ministry, grieving the consciences of the pious, and belonging purely to the department of congregational discipline." On these remarks Dr. Passavant expressed his deep regret." A lengthy debate ensued, in the course of which the President also raised the question, "whether the Council is willing to decide that all who do not accept the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church should be excluded from the Lutheran pulpits?" After lengthy disputes as to whether the questions were plain enough, and whether the President of the Minnesota Synod was entitled to advance them in behalf of his Synod, it was finally decided that the report should be left for consideration until next year. - The Rev. H. W. Roth pointed out the necessity of a more numerous representation in the present Council on the part of the different Synods, and of a more regular attendance on the part of those who had been sent here as representatives.

sam. It was decided that in the future the synods should see to it that the representation was greater. The free conference with us Missourians was also reported and regrets expressed for our non-attendance. How we are to reconcile this with the articles in the "***Lutheran and Missionary***" Missionars, which repeatedly
so bitterly against such conferences that our coming should have appeared as importunity, we do not understand that indeed. C.

Spirit of the General Council. Since the "***Lutheran and Missionary***" is edited by leading personalities of the ***General Council***, we are undoubtedly in the right if we consider the spirit that is expressed in that magazine to be that of the General ***Council.*** But, among other things, the editor of the "***Lutheran***" writes: "A worthy brother and warm friend of the Church writes to us: 'I am weary of the defense of the Pennsylvania Synod as brought by the Magazine. When are some of us going to stop eating dirt for Missouri (***get done eating dirt for Missouri***?) Shall the Pennsylvania Synod become what Missouri is? Should it come to that, the future of our English congregations will be over, and the descendants of the Germans themselves will fill the ranks of the unbelievers or those of other denominations. I hope that, for Missouri's sake, our ***General Council*** will not engage further in any questions, old or new. It would be useless in the end and only postpone the outcome. Missouri must come to us now. If we go to them, we shall all perish together ecclesiastically. We have already gone as far as ks truth, wisdom, or love requires or permits.' This was not written for the public, but it clearly expresses our own opinions and feelings on this point." Thus the "***Lutheran***." It is true that from our pen too have flowed harsh enough sounding judgments about the ***Council***; but the harshness was always in the facts which we had to report, and in the principles which we advocated. In the remarks we have communicated, however, there is a vulgarity coupled with proud contempt. Even the "***Lutheran Observer,***" which also reports the above, makes the following remark: "We have regarded the extreme symbolic position of Missouri as unfortunate and erroneous, but to characterize ecclesiastical union with them as 'eating dirt' is something that is just as contrary to Luther as to Paul." W.

The Presbyterians of the old and new schools in America united on Nov. 12, and immediately sent a cable dispatch to the Rev. Dr. Buchanan at Glasgow, expressing the wish that the Presbyterian! Churches of Great Britain and Ireland might likewise unite. If the Presbyterians had at last united on the ground of truth, who should not rejoice at the healing of the breach which has hitherto existed? Unfortunately, however, it is only too evident that the unification that has taken place is not even a doctrinal unification, much less a unification in the truth, but a consequence of the invasion of doctrinal indifferentism, of the spirit of union of this time; and this is highly to be deplored, for he who is indifferent to the truth is worse off than he who, out of weakness, fights zealously for error. Rev. 3, 15. 16. W.

To expel the **Bible from the state schools** is now often the watchword even of the Americans. The purpose of this is to win over not only the unbelievers, but also the Romanists, to the state schools, and finally, by this means, to "Americanize everything." But the "Catholic Messenger of Faith" of Louisville, Nov. 3, declares that it is an erroneous view "that Catholics would accept a religionless school, if all religion were banished from it, and we were only allowed to teach religion to our children on Saturday and Sunday. In order to achieve such a

The 'irreligious' will willingly enter into the bargain at this ridiculous price." The intention of the Romanists is rather to have the money for the public schools distributed according to the number of children in the existing confessional schools, for then they hope to receive the lion's share. W.

The *General Council* held its meetings this year at Chicago, November 3-10. Next year it will meet in Lancaster, Ohio.- The proposal of Dr. Passavant to found a Lutheran Seminary in Chicago, for which someone wants to donate a piece of land worth $20,000, was accepted, as well as a letter of reply written by Dr. Krauth to the Pope. - 500 sample copies of the German Kirchengesangbuch, which will also contain the liturgy of the ***Church Book,*** are to be printed. - A hymnal with liturgy for English Sunday schools is to be prepared. - Praeses Sieker of the Minnesota Synod asked some questions concerning communion and pulpit fellowship. The report prepared by a committee on the subject was received too late, and further consideration of the matter was postponed until next year, with the consent of the Minnesota delegate. - The mission stations in India and the management of the emigrant mission were taken over by the ***General Council***. The establishment of a mission among the immigrant Chinese is to be considered, and letters are to be written to the Lutheran Missionary Society in Finland concerning a mission among the Indians in Alaska. - It was decided to recommend to the District Synods that systematic benevolence be introduced into all congregations. - A Sunday School Book Committee is to examine the Sunday School books already published and issue new ones. - Dr. Krauth was chosen as a delegate and Prof. S. Fritschel was asked to represent the ***General Council*** at the Conference to be held next year in Leipzig. - A paper prepared by Dr. Krobel on the proper relationship and use of the various languages in church and school was adopted. - Next year, on Friday and Saturday mornings, the doctrine of justification will be discussed. - The Church Assembly expressed regret that the Missouri Synod had declined the invitation to free conference (with this body as such), but still agreed to give serious consideration to proposals relating to it.

Voice from General Synod to drop the name "Lutheran." Thus the "***Lutheran and Missionary"*** of November 4 reports: "Rev. S. P.
Sprecher of Albany, the son of Dr. Sprecher, in last week's number of the ***Observer,*** gives honest counsel that the General Synod should drop the name "Lutheran" and call itself the "Church of the Reformation." He says: "The General Synod-people generally reject the sectarian peculiarities of the Augsburg Confession. They retain only the great distinguishing doctrines of the Reformation. I submit that it is not fine to call this Lutheranism. Since we have rejected everything but the common doctrine of Protestantism, the proper name for the General Synod would be Church of the Reformation, or any name that would give expression to this fact.' Rev. Sprecher, however, is too honest for the editor of the ***Observer.*** He says he thoroughly disagrees." It is a pity that he does not also concur in so cheap a claim. C.

Doctrinal Conferences. In its fight against doctrinal conferences, the "***Lutheran and Missionary***" seems to be trying to make jokes about the "Lutheran Church Friend," who is highly averse to all instruction. Thus, in the October 15 issue, it says: "Some years ago, one also gained such a great love for doctrinal discussions and became so tired of the usual synod business that one tried to present it as the greatest American humbug. The mis-

souriers had set the example of holding long and learned debates, 'conferences,' and several synods of the East were at once so taken with doctrinal discussions that they could not praise them enough, while they disdained the business of the American synods as something too ridiculous for learned people to participate in. But since these doctrinal conferences have turned out so badly that each time the Missouri Synod has personified the lion in the fable, according to which it says: "The first part belongs to me because of my great honor; the second I take because I am the strongest; my excellent services in the Lutheran Church claim the third part, and whoever wants to take the fourth quarter from me, let him beware, for he will have me (the lion) as his enemy! The "***Lutheran and Missionary***" has considered this; he now thinks that in the doctrinal discussions not so much comes out that it is worthwhile to make great journeys and then in the end still have to give in. He now realizes that the lion wants everything from the start, and that is why it is not worth staying longer with him in the company business. He therefore does not expect much from the conference with the Missouri brothers in Chicago, but thinks that the former friendship is pretty much "played out. "The Magazine" is still full of rosy hope; though it has also given a mild rebuke to the Wisconsin Synod, that it has succumbed to a Conference, and gone over to the Missourians, yet it will not yet give up its old idol, Conference; it belongs also to the company of "the lion, the cow, the goat, and the sheep;" and one must confess, with the fable, "What should the poor beasts do, or which desires to have the lion for its enemy?" One must say that the thing is not so bad, for since the honored friend of the fable evidently assigns the role of lion to ----------the Missouri Synod because of their faithful adherence to and fighting for the pure doctrine of the Word of God, - since, therefore, the pure doctrine is actually the lion, which claims all four parts for itself, the poor little animals certainly do very well to surrender to this lion and to enjoy its protection against the wolf. - Only from a poor animal one could not expect this act of prudence; I mean from a donkey. For he thinks he can intimidate the lion by his braying. ----------R.

Augustana Synod. A Norwegian pastor tells us the following: "You know that for many years the Augustana Synod has fought against us. Recently it has also been swinging its sword against the Synod of Missouri. It has imported a great light from Norway in the person of Prof. A. Weenaas. It appears, however, that he takes his light exclusively from the wholesale men of Iowa. In the last number of the "Norske Lutheraner" (their organ) he praises the Synod of Iowa in the strongest terms. Their direction, after all, is so Lutheran, so biblically practical n. Especially their fight for the Lutheran confession against the Missourians is commendable. He drew his enthusiasm for Iowa mostly (it seems) from a memorandum Iowa issued to show the world that they were small and poor, but now (after ten years, as I recall) they are ***Somebody***. This document Prof. Weenaas cites as if it were a canonical writing. The same Professor prevailed at the Synod at Racine, two weeks ago, that the teachers in their Academy should not be obliged to be Lutherans. The academy "shall be a free American academy, and therefore not confessional, but confessionless." The present Principal is a Congregationalist (a Norwegian who has left the Lutheran Church) and one (American) teacher is a Baptist. The same was highly commended by the Professor (I was present at the Synod). He hoped that Synod would confirm her election."

Relationship of children to parents in America. The "Wanderer" in the N. Y. Tribune gives the following account of this: "We believe that for many years the character of the parental relation has become steadily weaker and less effective. Not only is there too much reliance upon our public system of education, but there has been a pretty general abdication of parental authority. The children do not love or at least treat their parents with the old reverence. They are disobedient without novelty, and disrespectful without remorse. Kindness inspires no gratitude, and self-sacrifice no sense of obligation. A father whose life has been devoted to his children, who are dearer to him than his life, may vainly look for a token of gratitude; and yet he will always continue to pursue the same unwise method, and by increased negligence try to win the love for which his soul pines. And so the domestic comedy-ah! is it not rather a tragedy? goes on. The young gentleman insults papa, the young lady defies mamma; well-meaning observers who offer their good counsel are bidden to mind their own business; from garret to cellar the children are constantly in mischief; ill-treated servants warn and are sent away; visitors avoid, where they can, the house which harbors such terrible children, who grow more and more intolerable as they increase in age and strength. The years advance, the little faults of childhood ripen and pass into the rottenness of overripe and incorrigible vices; and those unhappy children change from buds of little sins into the full and poisonous bloom of comparative depravity, and are themselves again destined to perpetuate disobedience, and in their turn to experience the discomfort which they formerly inflicted."

II. Abroad.

Pusey and the Lutheran Church. The Erlanger Zeitschrift of May of this year writes: "When in the summer of 1867 a larger article on the "mutual communion with the Scandinavian Church" appeared in the ***Guardian***, the most widespread ecclesiastical magazine in England, Pusey sent the following article to the editors for printing: "I am requested by various persons, clergy and laity alike, who are of one mind with me, to ask you for the inclusion of a few lines concerning a matter which, in our opinion, is of the highest importance for our Church. A powerful party, which, as we see it, throws itself merely on the question of how far Sweden has the Episcopal Succession, or how far Denmark will be willing to accept it from us, has for some time been agitating for the English Church to recognize the Scandinavian communities (***bodies, for the*** Puseyites do not want to know of any Church in Sweden and still less in the other Nordic countries) and to enter into ecclesiastical union with them. We know that any such recognition would be highly detrimental to any hope of reunion with the Orthodox Eastern Church, for which many of your readers pray with longing. For the Eastern Church has condemned Lutheranism as heretical. We are also convinced that any such tacit recognition of the Lutheran errors, even if it were out of ignorance of them, would be highly detrimental to our own claim to catholicity and would even make many waver in their loyalty to their own church, as the connection with the King of Prussia used to do for the bishopric in Jerusalem. We therefore ask the above-named persons, by the mercy of Christ, not to do violence to our conscience by endeavoring to obtain such recognition from the bishops who will meet in September, and we hope that a memorandum will be delivered to these bishops, giving all recognition to the bishopric of Jerusalem.

as long as that communion retains the Lutheran symbolical books, which we are convinced contain only heresy, from which God in grace has preserved us. I have recently set forth (in ***Essays on the Reunion of Christendom,*** to which writers of the Latin, Greek, and English Churches have contributed) some of the reasons which fill me with distrust even of the Swedish Succession. I have hinted at some, though few, of the Lutheran heresies. Now I am too busy with other unfinished works to enter into controversy. And what I have said here should be nothing more than an admonition to others to spare our consciences. All that matters to me here is to express a conviction, not to open an argument." - July 29, 1767. E. B. Pusey.

The Protestant Congress, which wanted to meet in Berlin at the beginning of October, was denied the use of the church for its meetings by the Consistory and the Protestant High Church Council with the approval of the King. The Protest. K.-Ztg. why the Prussian Church Regiment does not also remove Prussian preachers who belong to the Protestant Association from their pulpits?

Italy. King Victor Emanuel indulges in occasional handouts against the clergy. A government decree deprives the Italian priests and bishops of their previous exemption from military service. In order to make this decree as ineffective as possible, the Archbishop of Florence issued an appeal some time ago for the formation of associations to collect the sums necessary to buy out the exiled clerics.

Bavaria. The Ministry of Culture has forbidden the students of Regensburg to join the so-called Marian Congregation, a religious order under the direction of Jesuits, under penalty of dismissal from the university. Marian Congregation, a religious association under the direction of Jesuits. American Protestant parents whose children attend Jesuit schools have a better trust in the Jesuits than the Catholic minister of Bavaria.

By order of the King of Prussia, a synod is to be held in **Electoral Hesse to** initiate a new order of things in the ecclesiastical area, in which Lutherans, Reformed and Uniate are to participate as equals. All faithful Lutherans have therefore declared that they neither want to vote nor be elected to this Synod. They have already sent protests about this to the Minister of Culture, v. Mühler. Concerning this, a Kurhesse writes to the Leipziger Allg. K.-Ztg., (see No. Oct. 15.): "All the answers of Herr v. Mühler boil down to the one sentence that the King is in possession of all ecclesiastical power over the Lutheran Church; he can therefore do with it as he pleases. Here is the point where all Lutherans must unite with us to fight this fundamentally pernicious proposition, which has already brought so much disaster upon the Church."

The Evang. Reformirten Kirchenzeitung is written **from Nassau:** One believed at first here in the country that through Prussia our Uniate Church would be introduced more into the path of a federation, but one was very much mistaken. In the past, preachers were allowed to use either the Lutheran or the Heidelberg Catechism, both of which are considered confessional texts of our Nassau Protestant Church, in their confirmation classes. Recently, the Consistory in Wiesbaden has called the attention of the deaneries to forbid both catechisms to their respective preachers; on the other hand, our poor rationalistic state catechism has been reintroduced, to the great sorrow of many preachers who are faithful to the confession.